





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761118953488>



5 1991

15 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Thursday 11 April 1991

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Le jeudi 11 avril 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Bound Volumes

Production of bound volumes is no longer undertaken by Hansard. Subscribers who require bound sets are advised to retain their individual copies and make their own arrangements for binding.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Volumes reliés

Le Journal des débats ne sera plus produit en volume reliés. On recommande à ceux parmi les abonnés qui auront quand même besoin de volumes reliés de conserver les fascicules et de s'arranger personnellement avec un service de reliure.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 11 April 1991

The House met at 1000.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

POWERS OF ATTORNEY AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Powers of Attorney Act.

NATURAL DEATH ACT, 1990

Mr Sterling moved second reading of Bill 8, An Act respecting Natural Death.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 4(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Sterling: "Freedom is one of our most precious values. As we mature, the freedom to make decisions for ourselves, by ourselves, is a special value. As adults we strive for autonomy.

"But as we age, we become increasingly worried, indeed terrified, that this freedom will be wrenched from us. In accident, a sudden catastrophic illness, or a more insidious progressive dementia may leave us incompetent, unable to make decisions about ourselves.

"These decisions are further complicated by the alternatives available to us. Many of these alternatives were made possible by the recent advances in science and technology.

"Over the past decade, the proportion of elderly has increased throughout the world. This is forecast to increase at an accelerating rate over the next 50 years. At the same time individual autonomy is now given greater and greater value.

"The question, 'What would they have wanted?' is being asked more often by professional care givers, family and friends of the patients robbed by age or disability or the ability to let others know what they want."

The foregoing is a quote from the foreword of a booklet by Dr David William Molloy called Let Me Decide. Letting the individual decide for himself or herself is what Bills 7 and 8 are all about.

As a matter of interest, this is of special interest to us in terms of the process, because I believe this is the first time the Legislature has ever given the opportunity to a private member to have two private member's bills considered at the same time. I want to thank each and every member of this Legislature for giving unanimous consent for me to be able to bring both of these bills to the Legislature at this time. These bills are companion bills. Both of them deal with the furtherance of our individual rights, the right of the individual to make his or her own choices regarding medical treatment should a person become terminally ill or incapacitated. Bringing the two methods of ensuring one's

choices are honoured forward at the same time seems most appropriate.

I hope that the co-operation which the members have indicated to me by allowing me to bring both bills forward at the same time is an indication that this legislation will go forward that it will be viewed as a positive move for all of us and that it will not be considered as a partisan matter.

I think it is important to understand that these bills do not change our laws as to what a person can or cannot do with his or her life. Presently, any person who does not want to receive medical treatment can have such treatment terminated. That is clear in our Ontario law. Bill 7, An Act to amend the Powers of Attorney Act, only transfers this right to another specific individual when the person receiving the medical treatment can no longer speak for himself. Bill 8, An Act respecting Natural Death, allows a person to state his wishes in a legal document, often referred to as a living will, so that there will be no doubt about his decision should he no longer be able to express himself.

If Bills 7 and 8 pass second reading and are, I dearly hope, referred to a standing committee of the Legislature, it will provide, for the first time, a public forum in Ontario whereby people will have the opportunity to express their opinion on this issue.

It is vital that any legislation dealing with choices on future medical treatment not be buried in an omnibus health care act, because they are usually only known and considered by health care givers and hospital personnel. This legislation, if passed, would be used by a wide cross-section of the public. It therefore needs to be out front so that when an individual is at his lawyer's, assigning a power of attorney or making a testamentary will for the distribution of his assets after death, he will also consider giving a durable power of attorney dealing with medical concerns, or he might prepare a living will to state that if an irreversible condition occurs, he wants such treatment terminated under certain circumstances as outlined in his living will. I feel that if this legislation is too far removed from the ongoing business of most Ontarians, it will not be utilized in the manner that is intended.

I have indicated my openness and my willingness to entertain amendments to improve this legislation. For example, I can assure members that if they read Bill 8 and look to the penalty section, it provides a jail sentence for a doctor who does not follow the wishes of a living will. I have heard, because I introduced these bills a year and a half ago, some objections from physicians on this. I am not convinced that we need to threaten doctors with a jail term in order to follow or comply with a living will and would entertain, in committee, an amendment which would delete that penalty.

It has been suggested that these bills should include a provision for regular updating, such as an annual witness signature, to ensure that the designated person who has made the will still wishes that the "living" in fact be in

place. I would like to hear argument on that and would accept whatever the committee decides in that regard.

1010

I agree that there are word changes here and there which could improve this legislation and I am most amenable to hearing the public and members of the committee talk about this. This morning, however, I hope that we can get full agreement from this House to pass these bills in principle and then move on to full and open discussion. If we do not, if this initiative gets bogged down in political game playing, as it did, unfortunately, a year ago, or if the door is slammed shut simply because one feels these bills need some specific change, then we lose this window of opportunity to deal with death and dying in a humanitarian way.

Every day we hesitate means some individuals, families and health care givers are suffering needlessly, are wrought with indecision over providing treatment to someone who does not necessarily want that treatment but cannot communicate that wish or opinion. Sometimes members within a family have conflicting feelings on what is to be done when faced with this horrendous decision. I believe that either document, a power of attorney or a living will, would give a great deal of comfort to family members and the attending physician. These documents would provide a clear direction of a dying person's wishes.

In 1983, when I was a member of cabinet and the Provincial Secretary for Justice, I carried an amendment to the Powers of Attorney Act which enabled people to give their power of attorney over to someone else because of mental incompetency, but this only dealt with business assets. Prior to that, if a person lost his mental competency, the power of attorney ended when he lost his competency. That change was as a direct result of consultations with the Alzheimer Society and the recognition of the difficulty faced by people with this disease. However, these past changes only dealt with business assets; they did not deal with the choices of medical treatment.

Bills 7 and 8 will provide the same kind of protection, that the individual's opinions and choices will be honoured, even if you should become incapacitated or incapable of telling somebody those wishes at the appropriate time. They would allow one to die a natural death, with dignity.

I believe most people fear death far less than they fear the loss of control over their existence. They fear a loss of autonomy. This is something which often comes with increasing years, with illness or purely by accident. In any event, individuals should have some control over the quality of their life, particularly if that life is dependent on artificial means. Being able to make these decisions when one is capable to do so will provide comfort and a certain sense of security. I believe Ontarians should be granted the freedom to make their own decisions on their own future health care.

Mr Winninger: I rise in the broad spirit of non-partisanship to support Bills 7 and 8, An Act to amend the Powers of Attorney Act and An Act respecting Natural Death. I use the words "broad" and "non-partisanship"

judiciously, because it was the member for Carleton who spoke against my private member's public bill, Bill 18, before Christmas. Now I am confident that in the fullness of time the member for Carleton will reverse his ill-conceived views, particularly when he can see what kind of assistance that kind of heritage legislation can be to him in his own riding.

Bills 7 and 8 authorize a donor to name a person to consent to medical treatment, or the withdrawal of medical treatment or to have a living will, and with this proposed legislation I believe that the member for Carleton has made a strike for the right of people to control their own lives in the event of incapacity.

The actuaries tell us that four to five times as many people are as likely to become incapacitated as, say, to die prematurely, so these kinds of provisions are crucial to determine what happens to a person when he or she becomes incapable. There is a pressing need for these reforms so that a person can plan sensibly in the case of incapacity.

The living will is an instrument that has already been introduced to other jurisdictions, including the United States, and it is time that we had a similar provision here. Heretofore, a person could name an attorney to deal with his or her property in the case of incapacity, but not to deal with these essential personal care decisions that have to be made. If anything, perhaps this legislation does not go far enough. Certainly it deals with medical decisions; it does not deal with nutrition, hygiene, clothing and safety. For example, someone may become incapacitated and be given a diet that offends his religious code. This is something that also has to be addressed eventually with appropriate legislation.

The kind of legislation these bills anticipate would avoid the costly, time-consuming and rather cumbersome procedures to declare a committee for a mentally incompetent person under the Mental Incompetency Act. This is something—a rather cumbersome procedure, as I said—that unfolds where a person becomes incapable and a person has to be appointed to make decisions on that person's behalf, involving an application to court, involving the production of affidavits from all kinds of medical practitioners and nurses and friends and relatives citing the incapacity of this individual. This allows a donor to name a power of attorney to make these essential health care decisions in the event of incapacity and thereby avoid a rather onerous procedure under the Mental Incompetency Act. This would allow the donor to direct, for example, the use of life support systems, by making his or her wishes known to friends or relatives. This could also extend to blood transfusions, which would affect Jehovah's Witnesses and others who may be opposed to blood transfusions.

I support the bills with these reservations: There must be adequate means of ensuring that the donor of a power of attorney has capacity at the time that the donation of the power of attorney is made, and it is essential that there be some criteria as to who determines incapacity—and that is certainly a refinement that might be introduced to this act—and, further, who scrutinizes the power of attorney to

insure that it is carried forth in an honest, valid and helpful fashion to the person who becomes incapable.

I have one concern, and that involves the exception to Bill 8 for women who are pregnant. I realize that this raises immense ethical considerations, but let's say, for example, that we have a two-week old fetus, the mother is pregnant, the mother becomes incapable and could be suffering unendurable pain. The withdrawal of those life support systems could not be mandated in a situation like that, simply because of the exception provided for in the member's act. On the other hand, a fetus that is well advanced and viable outside the womb, through the induction of early birth or perhaps caesarian section, that fetus could survive and yet the mother would not have to endure what might be unimaginable pain. Yet because she is incapable, she cannot make decisions for herself.

I am also concerned that under the provisions of Bill 8 a living will can be revoked, not just in writing, but by the testator, if you will, indicating—and I take the words from the act—to someone “orally or by other non-written means” an intention to revoke.

020

I would suggest that this is open to considerable interpretation. If someone who is incapacitated and lying on his or her bed of sickness or imminent death makes a gesture towards the attorney or someone else, that could be interpreted as a revocation of the living will which would then enable the health care providers to continue with life support systems. That would certainly be a concern.

Last, I note that “health care provider” is not defined under Bill 8. “Health care provider” is a term, a term of art, I suggest, that is referred to in the bill but not defined, it is the word “physician,” for example.

I am also concerned that a health care provider who is unwilling to comply with the living will under the directives of this statute “shall, as promptly as is practicable, take all reasonable steps to transfer the care and treatment of the person to another health care provider who is willing to comply with the living will.”

The problem might be, how is a court going to define the words “reasonable” and “practicable”? A physician who is opposed to withdrawing life support systems, who might be indisposed to transfer this patient to another physician who would pull the plug, could conceivably take a week or two to transfer this particular patient. I know there are penalties provided, but it is all very interpretative and I think this is an issue that the member for Carleton should look seriously at.

But all things aside, I support the spirit of these bills.

Mr Daigeler: Let me say first of all that I appreciate the opportunity to speak again on the bills the member for Carleton is bringing forward. The members who are new, and perhaps the people who are watching across Ontario, may not know that we discussed this matter in the last session, and as we had an election since then, bills like this die in Orders and Notices with the election and they have to be reintroduced.

I do think the member for Carleton has raised a very important subject and I think he is to be congratulated for

that. I think the issue that he is raising is of profound importance, and as I indicated the last time when I spoke, I do support the basic premise from which the member is coming and I support the intention which the member for Carleton is putting forward.

The religious tradition I am coming from has always supported the idea that you do not have to prolong death by all and every means available, especially in view of our new medical technology. There is that distinction between what is called ordinary and extraordinary means of prolonging death, and in my tradition it is not necessary to use all the extraordinary means to prolong death.

I am quite insistent here—and in fact that is a reservation I expressed the last time—on using the term “prolonging death.” What is at issue here, and what is being expressed in the title of the bill, we are talking about prolonging death and not really sustaining life. It is very clear, and I am sure that is the member's intention, that in situations where it is definite that death can no longer be prevented and it can only be prolonged through technical and artificial means, in that case the medical technology no longer has to be employed. But I think, again, what we are talking about here, and I raise that as a reservation and hopefully as a change that may be made in committee or in committee of the whole, we always talk about the natural death will and not the living will, because I think terminology in this matter is extremely important.

We are all aware of some of the events that happened in this century with regard to euthanasia. The member for Carleton has presented us with some background material and, quite frankly, in some of that material that distinction is not clearly made. There is the unfortunate historical precedent that euthanasia in an active sense was used, and is still being used, in fact. Just recently in Austria some nurses were in fact found guilty for using euthanasia, active euthanasia. We have that experience where people use euthanasia to end the life of people against their own will and end it in a way that all of us would agree is immoral and illegal.

I think that is why it is so important to use the proper terms and the proper words and not to speak about life-sustaining but death-prolonging to make very clear that what we are talking about is prolonging by highly artificial means a process that all of us will suffer at one time in our lives or other. I think if the member would consider that in the debate in the committee, I certainly would feel much more comfortable about his bill.

Also, he has, perhaps unwillingly—I think in section 7 of the bill he is putting forward, Bill 8, he is referring to the fact that the withdrawal of death-prolonging procedures “shall be deemed not to be a suicide.” Again, I think this is rather questionable language. I do not think we should make any connection at all, even in words, with suicide and the intention of withdrawal of artificial death-prolonging procedures. I think it is very clear what the member's intention is, and I think that should be expressed in the words in the bill and should be very carefully made clear to the public.

I am also a bit concerned about introducing too many laws and too many legal provisions in this area. As several

members have said before, the practice of these wills is already happening in Canada and in the United States as well and other parts of the world, but I am somewhat uncomfortable about legalizing and introducing even more and more possibilities of litigation in these very, very difficult moments of life. I think we perhaps should leave a fair degree of discretion to our medical staff and to relatives in the way that is presently being done, that you can in fact put forward such a will and you can indicate what your wishes are, but to put the force of punishment and putting it into a legal definite framework, I have some questions about it.

Also, there is the fear that if somebody does not fill out a will, a natural death will, all others will then be treated and their death prolonged by all means because they have not signed this will. Again, while this is not the intention of the member, I think we should be very clear that all of us should be allowed to determine the treatment that is being given to us, and again, that is a basic principle of medical ethics that we should be allowed to decide the treatment that is being given to ourselves, and that all of us should not be forced through unnaturally prolonging means of keeping away that last moment on this earth that we will all be facing one day.

I think the member for York Centre will be adding some comments later on as well.

1030

Mr Arnott: I would like to at this time rise and indicate my intention to support bills 7 and 8, introduced by my colleague the member for Carleton, and I would like to congratulate him on these bills. I think the member for Carleton has gone to great lengths, over the past number of years in promoting this idea. It is something I feel very, very strongly about. The living will concept in principle is an excellent idea. I feel certainly there are moments when senior citizens or anyone can find themselves in a situation where they are unable to make their own determination about what their fate should be, and if they are allowed to transfer that responsibility over to someone they love and trust, that is a great improvement in our society.

As I mentioned earlier and the member for Carleton has alluded to earlier, this is not the first time that this idea has been brought forward in the Legislature. I would like to go back to Hansard of 26 April 1990, when my colleague and friend the member for Markham said in support of these ideas:

"I think the strength of what the member for Carleton has brought forward is it allows each of us to legislate what we want to have done for ourselves. That is a democracy at work. It allows freedom within society where there is a framework where that freedom shows great respect for each human being."

I feel very strongly and agree with those sentiments from the member for Markham.

I feel very strongly that we have to allow individual members of our society as much freedom as possible. In this area, it gives us an opportunity to extend freedom to the people in our society in a way that is so fundamental: towards the end of their life, or at some point to make

some determination as to how they want their death to occur, and to allow them a death with dignity. I feel very strongly in that respect.

In my opinion, I do not feel that it is appropriate or reasonable to assume that this intention in any way encourages or legalizes euthanasia. I know that some groups have brought that view forward. I would fundamentally reject that view. I think what it does is just allow for a death with dignity at the end of the road.

I know there is broad-based support across the province for this initiative. There are groups in rural Ontario certainly, called women's institutes, that most members I think will be familiar with. They are most strong in rural Ontario. I have about a dozen of these groups in my riding. They have taken up this cause and assisted the member for Carleton with this endeavour, and they have done an excellent job of promoting it across the population of Ontario, and I would commend them for that.

I would like, on a personal note, to talk about my own family. My grandmother about 10 years ago contracted something called ALS. Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis is the name of the disease. It is commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease. For a family member watching, in my case my grandmother, contract this disease and to see her deteriorate the way it was, it is the most incredible, heart-breaking experience.

It is a debilitating nerve disease. What happens if you contract it is that you lose control of the nerves in your body in different areas. First it was in her tongue and she had difficulty speaking and she had difficulty eating. Then it became in her legs and she had difficulty walking. It graduated to the point where she could only communicate with notes.

The really tragic part of the disease was that her mind was as sharp as it ever was. She was in her mid-70s; her mind was very, very sharp. When I was in university I was able to visit her on the weekends when I came home, and it was incredible. We would talk and communicate, she making notes and me of course talking to her verbally. She would each time remember the most minute details of my last visit. She obviously had a great deal of time to think and reflect about things.

It was just a very difficult time for our family to experience that while she was getting sicker and sicker. We kept her at home as long as possible, and when she finally had to be hospitalized about a month before she died, we were able to consult with the doctors as a family and, in conjunction with my grandmother's own wishes, to withhold heroic medical treatment to prolong her life, prolong her suffering.

I am concerned if a situation like that arises in other circumstances when there is not a family there to make that decision and to assist in that decision. If that is the case, I think it is very important that individual people have the ability to put that down in writing and make their concerns known, while they are of very sound mind as well as body, to make that known so that their wishes can be acted upon.

Again, I would just like to reiterate and congratulate the member for Carleton and the members for London

outh and Nepean, who have indicated their support. Personally, I was a little disappointed to hear the member for London South question the motives of the member for Carleton for the introduction of this bill. I did not think that was particularly appropriate. I know very well that the member for Carleton is putting forward this measure in a very sincere way to improve social law, I guess we call it, in Ontario.

I would like to conclude my comments by congratulating also the member for Carleton on this historic occasion when he is able to put forward two companion bills, which I think a historic occasion in this House for private members.

Mr Owens: I would like to begin my remarks by commending the honourable member for introducing this piece of legislation, or I should say reintroducing the legislation. I would like to assure the member that with this piece of legislation there will not be any game-playing and there clearly will not be any doors shut. I plan to support this legislation and I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the House will be supporting this legislation.

This bill, Bill 8, is clearly about the right to choose the final moments or the final months of one's life, and it is very important that we as legislators think about that. The discussion of death is never a pleasant subject, but it is one that needs to be dealt with in an honest and forthright manner. We all seem to think that we are going to go on living, until something happens and our time is cut short, for the time of a loved one, and we are faced with decisions that we are often not ready to make. We are often not prepared to have at our hand the wishes of our loved ones or to hand our wishes to other family members if it is us who are involved.

As the previous speaker noted, I too have had some personal experience with this issue. I lost three of my close family members within four years. Part of my job when my younger brother died, if one wants to call it a job, was to sit with him when he was 27 years of age, to talk to him about his death, to make him aware that, contrary to his belief, he was not going to leave the hospital, and to ask him how he wanted his affairs to be settled. It was a very difficult time for him and for myself as the sole surviving family member.

I think the honourable member's legislation will make this process easier for people to deal with at a time when we are not faced with the eventuality, the oncoming event that sometimes hits us square in the face like a two-by-four.

040

I do not have any profound quotes from philosophers about the right to die and the right to choose one's death as one feels is appropriate. I can say that after the events in my family, I got involved in working with terminally ill patients and doing the kind of support and the kind of counselling that is often so important to people, again, as they face those last moments here on earth. But I can tell members about the hugs I received from the folks I was working with after they had had the opportunity to discuss how they would like to die. More important is where they would like to die. Not everybody wants to die lying in a

hospital bed hooked to a resuscitator, with people pounding on his chest and drugs being infused in all parts of the body. This is not death with dignity. We need to start serving the human need rather than the systemic need that we seem to have served for so long.

The issue of euthanasia that was raised by the member from the opposition is clearly inappropriate. The opponents to this type of legislation raise this issue of euthanasia as a red herring to avoid the issue. Clearly, euthanasia and the right of persons who are *compos mentis* to decide how, where and when they are going to die are two different issues.

I agree with the honourable member that we should look at a way of updating the living will. There needs to be a period where the patient's wishes may change where people named in the will may or may not be available at the time, so we need to look at a mechanism for change.

I also would agree with the honourable member's suggestion that he accept an amendment to remove the penalty clause for physicians. I think in 1991 physicians are clearly becoming aware of the sociological change in our approach to the way people want to spend their last time and moments here on earth. Again, I would support that amendment.

In closing, I would like to thank the honourable member for his courage in bringing this piece of legislation back to this House, and I would like to applaud the member for giving me the opportunity to speak about what has been a very personal and traumatic experience for me. I am sure all members sitting in this House can relate a tale of a similar nature of how they have had to watch a family member linger in unnecessary pain, and with this legislation that may not have happened.

Mr Sorbara: I just want to begin by commenting and congratulating my friend the member for Scarborough Centre on his remarks on both the bills, Bill 7 and Bill 8, and appropriately, I congratulate the member for Carleton on bringing forward this legislation again. He is a feisty and persistent member. When he gets a project in his portfolio and before this House, he continues to press it with determination.

The last time he had this bill here we ran out of time in Parliament. Actually, we did not run out of time, but we decided Parliament would come to an end. Who made that decision? Can we revisit that? So we are back here again. Probably we would have passed this bill and it may have become law, even though it is rare that private members' bills actually become law.

It seems to me, if I understand the speeches made in the House this morning, that there is little doubt this bill is going to carry through second reading and that my friend from Carleton will then be able to have an opportunity to press his views on this bill through the appropriate committee and then back for third reading.

I want to say to my friend the member for London South and my friend the member for Scarborough Centre that if they really do believe what they say, what they have said this morning in this debate, then I think an obligation falls upon them which goes beyond the speeches they gave in Parliament this morning.

This matter is somewhat procedural, Mr Speaker, but I hope you will bear with me. I want to say one or two things about the substance of the bill.

Having sat in this House for some seven months, they probably know by now that a bill that passes second reading here during private members' hour goes into a kind of limbo. Unfortunately, most of those bills die a natural death. It is interesting that we are talking about that in a bill that is actually called An Act respecting Natural Death. But there is a way to make this bill a living bill and part of the living law of the land; that is, if the members opposite, the government members, decide they really want it to happen, not just make it an opportunity this morning to make speeches about the importance of respecting the wishes of someone who is terminally ill or someone who wants to be able to die a natural death and not have the intervention of life support systems or the intervention of things that are against a religion or against a certain style of life.

They can do something more than give the speeches. They can prevail upon their caucus colleagues who sit in cabinet to ensure that the bill not only goes through the committee process—it has the refinements my friend the member for Carleton was suggesting—but also comes back to this place for third reading. That is when we really test the mettle of the government members and what they say they believe in. I think that should happen with this bill.

I do not think it is as easy as the sponsor of the bill, the member for Carleton, has suggested. I do not think it is as simple as has been suggested by some of the government members. When this bill does become part of the living law of the land, I think significant controversies will arise. After all, we are not changing the Hippocratic oath that governs the ethics of every physician and indeed every health care professional in the province. Their mandate is to intervene, in a sense, at all costs, to ensure that life is maintained.

There is no doubt that in the personal experience of all of us, whether with family members, with friends or acquaintances or in conjunction with our responsibility as politicians, every one of us has seen instances where the real desire of the individual was to let life slip away, not in some morbid sense, but because real life was no longer there. Life was being maintained through mechanical devices or chemical devices, but the real wish of the individual was to let the end arrive naturally. That is what this bill is all about.

Although I strongly believe that 99% of the work of this Parliament ought to be devoted to the rigorous support of life in our province, there is room for this addendum to that law, to acknowledge that our technical capacity to maintain life sometimes, in a few rare instances, will exceed the desire of the individual to have his or her life mechanically sustained.

Indeed, my colleague the member for Scarborough North, sitting right here beside me, refers to an instance in his own family where those hard choices had to be made and life support systems removed. It is not as easy as we think, as we talk about this bill. The decisions are terribly

painful. Anyone who has had to make that sort of decision, participate in that decision or then watch life slip away after the systems have been unplugged, have been removed, knows the extent to which that is a difficult and heart-rending process to go through and to watch.

I want to add my congratulations to those we have heard from other members, to the member for Carleton for bringing forward this measure. Again, I have no doubt this Parliament is going to last long enough to deal with this bill through all of its phases, committee and then third reading. I want to reiterate once again, to the few government members who are sitting here this morning for second reading of this bill, that this bill is in their hands when this debate is over. We encourage them to make sure we see it again in this Parliament.

1050

Mr Carr: I wanted to rise to offer my support to the bill and thank my colleague for bringing it forward. I think the previous speaker said it very well. He is very tenacious and hardworking and we appreciate that. Sometimes in this House that is what you need to do, and I compliment him for that.

I also just wanted to take a quick minute to thank some of the members who have shared very personal and private situations with the House. It must have been very difficult to do that, but it does help add to the debate. I want to thank the members who have done that and shared that with us.

I also wanted to just talk a little bit about the last debate that went on and read a little of the copy from the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore, who is now of course the Minister of the Environment. Her statement on that day was: "I believe we will find, when we discuss it more broadly, that there is a broad general support for it and that the government will not drag its feet, will not try to reinvent the wheel by coming up with legislation that it can claim to be its rather than something that was introduced by an opposition member, but will move forward and proceed through the process of bringing" this bill, meaning that bill of the day. "As I say, I am very proud to support it."

I would hope some people on the government side reflect upon it, that we not leave the debate here and leave all the good ideas on the floor and that people will try to the best of their ability. I think the new members opposite will attempt to do that. We were all elected to try to improve the situation in this province, and I would encourage those people on the government side to push by whatever means are necessary to get this legislation through. There has been a lot of work done on it, there is broad support for it and I would encourage everyone to attempt to push this through so we can make some meaningful changes to the process in this province. Those are my comments.

Mr Silipo: In the few seconds I have left, I want to just simply express my support for these two bills for a couple of very fundamental principles which are, after all, what the second reading debate is all about, supporting things in principle. The principles that are in the two bills are the right of the individual to have control over his or

er life and affairs, and to make decisions at a time other than a time of crisis, which I think is significant in both of these. Certainly there are improvements we can make in the committee process, but I would support it at this time.

The other is on the principle that I think a couple of people mentioned, which is that of support for private members' initiatives, of which I am a very strong supporter. I will certainly continue to do everything possible to make sure that the roles of private members and those initiatives get heightened, particularly when they deal with issues such as this. I regret that the previous government did not take some of those actions to support and expand those provisions, and I hope this government can do that.

Mr Winninger: Mr Chairman, on a point of personal privilege: In reference to remarks made earlier by the member for Wellington that I had questioned the motives of the member for Carleton, I would like to make it quite clear that at no time did I question the motives of the member for Carleton in bringing forward this bill, and that the member for Wellington was as wrong about my questioning the member's motives as he was about my riding.

Mr Jordan: It is my privilege also to speak in support of the bill and in support of my colleague the member for Carleton. I know him to be sincere in the presentation of this bill. I am not going to speak at length, but just to bring to the attention of the House the things that come to the fore, in my opinion, relative to this bill.

I think we are all aware of the changes in medical treatment, the new equipment that is available and the desire by the medical profession and others to try to use that equipment to the best advantage, and I believe sometimes—I know my own personal experience has been, as many others have stated, the prolonging of life to the point that it becomes a mechanical life rather than a human life. I think it is important that we have at our disposal this type of legislation that would make a decision on ending those mechanical-type lives, or other types of prolonging the different kinds of diseases we are facing today, such as cancer and so on, where you are actually given the option that if you want treatment you can have three months of life, and if you do not take it you probably have a month.

These are the types of things families are dealing with today and I think the member for Carleton's bill will allow these discussions to take place beforehand and in an organized manner.

Mr Sterling: If I could use the time remaining to my caucus, four minutes-plus, and the two minutes together I would appreciate it. I would like to thank each and every member. It is amazing that when we are discussing something which is really an issue which has probably affected everyone's life in the Legislature, we can have eight speakers express in a very succinct amount of time their support for what I consider very important pieces of legislation.

I was very touched by the member for Wellington and the member for Scarborough Centre in relaying their personal cases to the Legislature. I saw many members nod in agreement with them and thinking probably, as I was at that time, back to a personal experience which I have experienced.

I was very much interested in the member for London South's remarks when he talked about the various issues raised by the various sections in the bill. To be quite truthful and blunt, I am not certain of all of the decisions I made when I put those provisions in the bill, but I put them there so we would have a long and a fruitful discussion when we, and if we—and I believe we will—get to a standing committee. I would like to hear those arguments. I want to hear what the real feelings of members of this Legislature are on each and every section of this bill. I will no doubt have my opinion. I went down the list of choices and made my choices at that time.

As each and every member of this Legislature knows, when they draft a private member's bill they do so in some isolation from other members. Therefore, if and when we get to the stage of amending this bill, I look forward with great anticipation to the opportunity to hear what people from the outside want to deal with, their general overall feeling, and what the general consensus of 12 or 13 members of this Legislature would be on each and every issue which the member for London South in particular raised here.

Quite frankly, when this bill gets out to a committee, I think it will probably be one of the most exciting experiences for members of a committee of this Legislature to have in committee because they will have the real opportunity of having their input and say into a law. When we vote on the various different sections, I hope we will not vote along party lines. In other words, my party normally has two members on that committee. I would not expect them to vote in concert on each and every amendment or each and every section. I would hope each and every member will bring their combined wisdom to the bill, so that when we work the bills through the committee level, we will have a consensus of all 13 members, regardless of what political stripe they might or might not wear.

I point out to the member for Nepean, who expressed some concern about having too much legislation dealing with this matter, that the reason I bring the matter to the fore is so there will not be confusion in the public's mind as to what is or is not valid as a living will, or what is or is not valid as a durable power of attorney. I use the legislation to bring forward issues which are in the public's mind or which would be in the physician's or the health care giver's mind who is faced with that decision. I want those all out in the open so that we can draw the proper conclusions in dealing with these very important documents.

I also would hope that when the committee comes down to the final document, we will try to keep it as simple as is possible. We will have to make some decisions which will perhaps not be perfect, but that is the way all legislation is. But it is very important in my view that whatever we do come out with, the public is able to understand what our intent is and what the rules might be surrounding these two particular documents.

I would also like to thank the member for Dovercourt for his succinct and very pointed remarks on the bill. I think he makes two very valid points, and I congratulate him on how quickly he can do that. I would also like to thank both the member for Oakville South and the member

for Lanark-Renfrew for their participation in the debate as well.

Last, I would like to thank five individuals with Dying with Dignity of Canada who are sitting in the members' gallery. These people have been travelling across this country and telling the story of these two bills along with their full efforts to allow people the right to die with dignity. I would like to recognize Don Elliott, who is the president of Dying with Dignity of Canada, Isabel Dunning, Irene Birch, Jean Skelhorne and Marilynne Seguin, who is the executive director of this very important association. There are thousands and thousands of people behind you. The members can assure you of that.

1100

WETLAND PROTECTION

Mr Wiseman moved resolution 10:

That, in the opinion of this House, the standing committee on resources development should be asked to review the current effectiveness of governmental efforts to protect wetlands in southern Ontario and, in particular study the following matters:

1. The circumstances and the frequency of wetland loss, with special emphasis on the pressures created by urban development on such wetlands and watersheds as those found in the Altona Forest, Frenchman's Bay, Carruthers Creek, and others that are experiencing similar impacts;
2. The adequacy of governmental laws, policies and programs for ensuring that there is no net loss of this valuable resource;
3. Whether there is a need for a comprehensive wetland protection statute in Ontario;
4. The need for education programs on the value of wetlands;
5. The desirability of establishing a provincial office for wetland protection in order to centrally administer, monitor and enforce all governmental laws, policies and programs;
6. Ways to promote the creation of new wetlands;
7. Ways to resolve conflicts arising from farm activities that impact upon wetland viability; and
8. Any other matter the committee considers relevant to wetland preservation.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 94(c)(i), the member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Wiseman: I would like to just take some time and review a little bit of the history of this topic in the House. In May 1986, Mr Knight, who was then a member, I think from Burlington or southern Ontario, also moved a resolution that was asking for wetland protection and looking for the government to move on wetland legislation. I think perhaps that was brought forward in a climate that was not quite as aware of environmental issues as we are today.

Since that time, we have had a number of reports that have been written. We have had the Brundtland re-

port, we have had the first stage of the Crombie commission come out, we have had the second stage of Watersheds come out, an awful lot of work done by the Federation of Ontario Naturalists and other environmental groups who are interested in protecting wetlands. We have recently a study on preserving the Great Lakes wetland and environmental agenda, which I will talk to, if I have time, at some length. We have had back in 1986 an evaluation of wetlands. We have had in 1980 a study done by Michele H. Lemay, a thesis presented to the University of Waterloo in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of master of arts on regional planning and resource development that talks about the history of wetlands and their erosion in southern Ontario. We have had a large compendium of research put together and we have had many publications by naturalists and other organizations on wetlands. So I think we are well into understanding what wetlands are and how wetlands develop. But I would like to take just a moment to define what a wetland is.

Basically a wetland is an area of land that is covered with water for all or part of the year. They occur, as their name implies, at the intersection of land and water as small inland marshes along lakes or streams or as part of the vast northern peat lands. Wetlands are characterized by hydrophilic soils and specific types of flora and fauna especially adapted for wet conditions. In general, four types of wetlands are found in southern Ontario: marshes, swamps, bogs and fens. In this document there is a good definition of each of those. I do not have time to relay the definition of each, but for the members who are interested, this information is available.

I would like to take a couple of minutes to look at the positive aspects of wetlands and why they are important. Much has been written about wetlands. In the past, people have seen wetlands as an area that should be drained and developed. In my own riding, for example, Carruthers Creek has been seen as an area that should be dredged out and turned into a marina, with surrounding lands turned into marina complexes, hotels and condominiums. What we lose if we do this kind of development is what the Brundtland report called sustainability. There are positive aspects of a wetland, and I would like to turn to those for a moment.

They support diverse species of waterfowl. Wetlands have ducks; in my riding, for example, we have ducks, we have swans, we have geese and all sorts of different types of birds. I am not going to pretend for one second to be as conversant with the bird population in my riding as some of my friends are in the Federation of Ontario Naturalists and the Pickering naturalists, but there are large numbers of various types of birds that live in these areas.

Wetlands also protect water resources. I have been told that a wetland will filter water, will make it purer than it was when it started out, and that it cleanses, it takes out heavy metals, and it will actually act as a filter and a filtering agent for the lakes and for the streams.

They support coastal estuaries, fishery resources. For example, they are the source of spawning. Many variou

types of fish are spawned in these waters and then move from there into the deep lake where they are then are part of the resource base. I will turn to that in a moment.

They protect shorelines from erosion and wave actions. They are nursery areas for young shellfish and crustaceans. They function as a solar-powered water purification system, as I described. They can modify acid precipitation and sulphur, heavy metal impacts on aquatic ecosystems, and they can act to trap pesticide residue.

Equally, they form a wonderful opportunity for young people to become more in touch with nature. On more than one occasion, I know from the school where I used to teach, we on a regular basis took the students to canoe in the marshes and the wetlands and to get up close. There is nothing more pleasurable than to trudge along the shoreline of a wetland and look at the flora and fauna and the birds, and there is nothing more exciting for young children to see than fish migrating up the streams to spawn. I think we need to continue to protect that aspect of our heritage.

110

I would like to speak for a moment of economic reasons why we should protect our wetlands. Wasaga Beach, for example, has a commercial tax base of \$20.86 million. We need to protect these beaches with wetlands as well. For example, Long Point and Point Pelee marshes in Ontario are priceless natural reserves, but they also generate \$5 million a year in tourist revenue. In Ontario, estimates are that wetlands-related tourist activities account for \$853 million annually, plus another \$11 million for licences and fees. All in all, Canadians spend upwards of the astonishing figure of \$4.2 billion annually on wildlife-related activities, many of which are connected with wetlands, so important as a habitat. These figures are from a recent Environment Canada survey.

In Ontario, crops of fur, wood and wild rice have been valued at \$300,000 annually. In 1980, muskrat harvest in Manitoba fetched \$2 million; marsh-hunting in BC, \$43 million; in Alberta, \$38 million.

Another study revealed that an acre of wetland was worth the following: \$1,054 for sport fishing, \$1,040 for fish production and \$720 for waterfowl breeding and feeding. Adding the utility values produced a total of \$4,700 an acre. So members can see there is a good economic reason to support the protection of wetlands.

Unfortunately, there are many impacts on wetlands that are eroding and causing the amount of wetlands to be reduced. Agricultural development is one of these. I think we need to investigate the possibility of rewarding farmers for keeping wetlands as wetlands, instead of putting restrictions or putting roadblocks in the way of farmers being able to do that.

Sewage treatment plants—in my riding and in southern Scarborough, we have lost wetlands to the construction of sewage treatment plants.

Cottages and resorts, warehouse and docking facilities, dredging and filling for harbour expansion—in fact, 85% of total marsh acreage loss in the early years, prior to 1931, was due to urbanization.

Parking lots are particularly hard on wetlands, because they speed up the runoff of water into the river valleys and then there is an unnatural gush of water through the wetlands that creates a huge problem for spawning fish and for the waterfowl, and then at the other end of the year, when there is no rain, the rivers dry up and there is not this continuous influx of water. So we have a problem where we have to consider the impacts of urbanization on wetlands.

Drainage of storm waters, as I have just said, is a large issue.

I am running a little short of time, but I think that what we need to do is to move forward with this resolution so that the standing committee on resources development can investigate all of the issues, all of the documentation that is present, and come up with a comprehensive legislation and a bill which can be introduced to the House for all members to peruse. I think we should do this as quickly as we possibly can and move forward in an expeditious manner. I think a lot of the work has been done, so I would like to see some rapid movement.

Mr Ramsay: I would like to applaud and support the member for Durham West's resolution this morning. I want to tell him that I support that. I have a couple of provisos I would like to speak to this morning, but I really support his interest in this topic, a topic that is extremely important to the ecosystem of this province and to this continent.

I appreciate his beginning remarks. He started to define what a wetland is, and I want to talk a little bit to that. I want to talk in a little more detail later on about the implications of wetland with regard to the agricultural industry. As you know, Mr Speaker, the agricultural industry has been a direct threat to the survival of wetlands, and I think it is very important that we think anew with regard to wetlands and agricultural application. I would like to touch upon that a bit.

I think it is important that we get on with this. I appreciate the member's listing all the reports and all the studies that have occurred over the years, and I must say—and I hope he is contact with the Minister of Natural Resources—that there is a wetlands policy sitting there ready to go. The previous government had worked on this. The draft report has been released and further consultation has taken place with a number of groups across the province. In fact, approximately 250 submissions have been received back from the government, from such groups as the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the anglers and hunters of Ontario, the AMO and other individual conservation groups.

I must say that the release of the approved final policy statement was expected this fall. I really cannot understand why we have not seen this yet, and I certainly do not want to put any roadblocks in the member's way of having our committee—a committee of which I am a member as the Liberal caucus Natural Resources critic—because I think it is important that we look at this. But I just do not want to see this additional look-see, if you will, of all the data that are already out there put any roadblocks in the progress of getting the government, getting this Legislative Assembly

moving forward on adopting an Ontario wetlands policy. I think that is very important and we have got to be working together here in the goodwill that I know is possible in this House.

Why do I say that time is of the essence here? I would just like to give a couple of examples of what has happened in the last few months in southern Ontario with regard to wetlands. We have had golf courses established on class 1 and 2 wetlands. We still are having residential subdivisions within class 1 and 2 wetlands; retail and commercial facilities within a class 2 wetland recently; a landfill and waste incinerator within a class 2 wetland; and of course, roads and bridges and infrastructure of all sorts across this province are still being built on class 1 and 2 wetlands. I think the member would agree that this has to stop. We have to have a new appreciation of the value of wetlands. So I would like to talk to that a bit.

Before I go on to that I would like to say to the member that in his resolution he really has not referred to our greatest wetland resource. That, of course, takes place, as the member for Cochrane North will know, mostly in his riding, in northern Ontario, because the James Bay wetlands are the largest wetland reserve in the world.

While I am on that, I would like to talk about what a wetland is in maybe just a little more detail for the people who are watching at home, because our sense in the past has always been that if the land were wet, what we had to do was drain it, that somehow wetland was a waste of a resource, that it was useless and therefore, in order for personkind to prosper, we had to drain a wetland. Of course, we understand now the valuable resource that it is.

But what is a wetland? And I guess the question is, why is it wet? It is wet because it is a reservoir. What nature has developed is a reservoir system for fresh water on our planet. It is a tremendous reservoir that holds water in times of tremendous rain accumulation, but also in time of drought. What it is basically is a sponge. The reservoir is a sponge that holds that fresh water resource, and we in Ontario happen to be blessed with the largest wetland in the world. From that a lot of prosperity has flowed, because we have this fresh water resource in our province.

Also, and I think more important today, is the way we have been treating our environment. The wetlands are also a filter and what we receive from the wetlands with regard to fresh water is clean fresh water. It filters out the impurities, and I think that certainly has to be addressed. Of course, the member had mentioned the other important aspect of wetlands. It basically is that wetlands are the home of a total ecosystem which it is very important for us to be preserving.

1120

I would like to mention one aspect that I would hope the member would bring to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. It is something I have been working on, and that is with regard to the Drainage Act. The Drainage Act was one of the first acts that was established in this House. It was established in the 1800s and it was a very good act for its day. It was an act that really opened up the farm land in southwestern Ontario, and primarily it was designed for southwestern Ontario.

That act is out of date. The Drainage Act needs to be brought up to date, with the awareness that we have today for the environment. We have to be looking at its application. What we have seen with the Drainage Act is, yes, some farm land that is a bit wet being drained and added to the tremendous productivity of Ontario's agriculture. But we have also seen in that application some tremendous disasters. We have seen some tremendous erosion disasters caused by Drainage Act construction and maintenance. We have also seen wetlands and woodlots being drained by main drains going by these tremendous resources. We have to make sure that we have an environmental assessment process established, tagged on somehow to the Drainage Act. That is something that has to happen.

In the other regard, we may have to make sure that we have cost-benefit studies mandatory on every drain petition that is brought before every municipal council under the Drainage Act. That is extremely important, because we have had horrendous projects that have done tremendous environmental damage and have also been costing the people involved along that drainage land, causing a tremendous financial impact.

There is much to do and I would encourage the member to push his government, as we are over here in the Liberal caucus, to move on the implications of the implementation of wetlands policy for this province. He will get a lot of support in this House from all parties if he does that, and we welcome the discussion that will accrue, from this resolution today, in the standing committee on resources development of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Mr McLean: I am pleased today to have the opportunity to comment briefly on this resolution. It would have been nice to have had the Minister of Natural Resources here to listen to the comments and to participate in this bill.

Wetlands are areas that are seasonally or permanently covered by shallow water, as well as lands where the water table is close to or at the surface. The presence of abundant water has caused the formation of hydric, or waterlogged, soils and has resulted in the development of hydrophytic, or water-tolerant, vegetation.

The four major categories of wetlands are swamps, marshes, bogs and fens. The province of Ontario accounts for approximately 23% of Canada's remaining wetlands, the most of any province or territory. Seventy-five per cent of Ontario's original wetlands south of the Precambrian Shield have disappeared. In parts of southwestern Ontario, over 90% of the original wetlands have been lost. Conversion to agricultural land is said to account for an estimated 85% of recent losses. Cottage and urban development have also contributed to wetland destruction.

At one time, wetlands were considered to be of little value and were frequently drained to create fertile agricultural land, but it is now recognized that wetlands are a critical component of the natural environment and drainage has become unacceptable.

As my party's critic for Natural Resources, I am well aware of the importance of this province's wetlands. They are vital to Ontario's economy. Wetlands maintain and improve water quality, help control flooding, provide habitat

for fish and wildlife and contribute substantial social and economic benefits. These benefits include outdoor recreation and tourism advantages from such activities as hunting, fishing and birdwatching, amounting to over 53 million user-days per year for more than seven million residents.

Wetlands were described by early settlers as impenetrable, mosquito-infested, God-forsaken swamps. The notion that wetlands were a nuisance persisted until only a few years ago, when the Progressive Conservative government of Ontario pointed out that they could provide a number of important benefits that can be grouped into three categories: ecological, social and economic. Until that time, Ontario's wetlands had been considered on the basis of their value for such uses as agricultural, commercial, industrial or residential development and little consideration had been given to their value when left in a natural state.

In January 1989 the Liberal government released its draft policy statement on wetlands planning in Ontario. The draft policy was circulated for public review and comment, and analysis of the draft policy indicated that it was completely inadequate in responding to the need to protect Ontario's wetlands. The policy statement and the implementation guidelines were too vague to be meaningful and would do little to save Ontario's remaining wetlands.

I would like to spend a little time to outline some of the concerns I had about the Liberal draft policy statement on wetlands planning in Ontario. I think it is important to do so when we are here today to consider this related resolution. The policy merely protected class 1 and class 2 wetlands which are provincially significant. According to experts, only 40% of this province's wetlands fall into these categories. That means that under the Liberal policy, 50% of the remaining wetlands would be sacrificed. This would include regionally and locally significant wetlands that may be vital habitats for rare plant and animal species.

The Liberal proposal was not binding on municipalities. It provided guidance and suggestions to municipalities on how to deal with wetlands. It is possible that some municipalities would ignore the province's directives, either because of development pressures or because of a lack of expertise in wetland planning.

The Liberal policy stated that northern Ontario wetlands would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As there is no formal evaluation system in place, this could lead to arbitrary decision-making, further jeopardizing northern wetlands, and I think we have already seen one example too many of arbitrary decision-making from the Minister of Natural Resources. I am referring to his recent arbitrary decision to allow unrestricted native hunting and fishing in Algonquin Provincial Park.

Finally, the Liberal draft policy enshrined the concept of compatible development, which would allow development on or adjoining wetlands so long as the wetland was maintained or enhanced. To determine if the wetland has been maintained or enhanced, the wetland evaluation system would be used for southern Ontario wetlands and this evaluation system would not adequately take into account the hydrological value of a particular wetland, and as a result, very important wetlands would be lost. I think

members will agree that far from being a step forward in the preservation of Ontario's vulnerable wetlands, the Liberal wetland draft policy was really just a step sideways.

While we are debating this resolution today, I think we should all be asking ourselves the following questions: Should wetlands be protected by the province? If so, should wetland protection be enshrined in legislation, rather than a non-binding policy statement as proposed by the former Liberal government? Should a non-development approach be adopted in relation to all wetlands, or just to those which are evaluated as provincially significant? Should the wetland policy be extended to cover at least class 1, 2 and 3 wetlands to be consistent with the conservation land tax reduction program?

Are there some wetlands that could be considered dispensable? Should Ontario move to implement an evaluation system for northern wetlands? Should the evaluation system be upgraded so that the hydrological value of a wetland is as important as its value in terms of flora and fauna? If so, should the province commit funds to the development of technology which will allow for the evaluation of wetlands on hydrological grounds? These are many questions that need to be answered.

1130

I want to relate a letter I got from the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority and it has to do with land tax rebates on conservation land. "Under the previous administration we had a 100% tax rebate on land such as the Minesing Swamp. The indication that I am getting now is that this government is wanting to change that, to be reduced to a 75% land tax rebate."

I think that is unacceptable. I think that when we are looking at a policy on wetlands that allows people to make sure that it is under the conservation program, that 100% taxation rebate should still be there. I do not believe it should be reduced, as the minister and the government at this time are proposing to reduce it. so I congratulate the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority for bringing it to my attention so that I can relate this to the minister and express the feelings here when we are dealing with this very important issue, wetlands in Ontario.

Mr Waters: I am going to be quite brief on this. I would just like to make the point that I would even like to see the legislation go somewhat farther than is being asked for here. As a member of the standing committee on resources development, we have been talking to some extent about purple loosestrife and the type of invasion that is going on in our wetlands by this type of thing that we as a society have introduced, with no regard or forethought to our wetlands.

I think that we should in some way include this type of thing in legislation and work towards the eradication of this, as well as stopping the urban sprawl and the encroachment by farming on wetlands. They are very important to us, and if we do not do something in the near future, we will be losing more valuable acreage of wetlands.

Mrs Sullivan: I am pleased to join in this debate and to recognize the initiative of the member for Durham West in bringing the issue of wetlands preservation policy before the

House. I am going to be supporting this resolution because I think it affords members an opportunity to explore that part of our heritage and that part of our future which is embodied in a policy or approach to wetlands preservation. The more that people know about these issues, members of this House included, the more they will be taken into account, not only in our private lives but in public policy as well. For those reasons, I think this is a useful resolution.

But I will tell members frankly that if this resolution passes this morning, and it appears that it will, and the resources committee has an opportunity to review these issues in some detail, I think that members of that committee will expand the mandate which the member for Durham West has included in this resolution. There are three specific areas where I see expansion to be of some value.

One would be to explore choices affecting wetlands preservation in northern Ontario and not limit the committee's review to a southern Ontario scope.

Second would be—and I think the member for Durham West has to a certain extent addressed this, I think in section 2, the inventory section—to incorporate a practical and pragmatic approach to the examination of the competing influences which bear on the development and maintenance of wetlands policy, whether that competition comes from power generation requirements, pressure of urbanization, landfill sites, agricultural practices or other areas which have been mentioned by other speakers. I think that we have to look not only at where competition exists, but where that competing activity can be taken out of the contest and where it in fact can be made complementary to preserved wetlands in an area.

Third, I think that the discussion in committee ought to take place within the context of a final wetlands policy document from the Minister of Natural Resources, around which there would be a framework for the examination of public policy actions.

In preparing notes for this debate, I went back to my files and I reviewed the original draft wetlands policy statement and implementation guidelines which were issued under the Planning Act by Vince Kerrio, then Minister of Natural Resources, and John Eakins, then Minister of Municipal Affairs. That document was released in January 1989. Those documents were sent out for public review and over a period of time received widespread comment from some 250 individuals and groups.

The member for Simcoe East has indicated that the response in fact demanded stronger action than was proposed in those documents and suggested that the proposals, from a public point of view, did not go far enough. But there certainly was an expectation that there would have been a final wetlands policy issued in the autumn of 1990. Those members who have an interest in these things may remember that I asked the Minister of Natural Resources a couple of weeks ago through a member's statement when we could expect to see a statement and some progress made on legislation.

The Federation of Ontario Naturalists and the Canadian Environmental Law Association have requested that statement by the end of this month and in fact that legislation would be enacted after discussion and input from

those groups by 1992. I think that it is vital to have that kind of statement of direction from the minister so that all members can place the discussion within a context and then move from there.

In section 1 of his resolution, the member has called for an inventory of the circumstances and frequency of wetland loss, and of the particular influence of urban encroachment, with reference to specific sites. There is considerable evidence that in days past most of the area which includes that which he represents, through Metropolitan Toronto, through the area, that I represent in Halton, down to the area represented by the member for St Catharines and into the Niagara Peninsula and further on up into the Greys and Bruces, was all bog, fen or marsh.

There have been special preservation efforts that we know about, and I think particularly of areas such as the Luther Marsh or Beverley Harbour, Jordan Station, the Hillman Marsh and so on—Beaverdale Fen may be another one—which have recognized the value of those wetlands, and the special ecological influences of the area have been maintained, sometimes by accident but frequently by design. I suppose what we are all looking for is a context and a definition of the design. That is why we need a document from the minister.

I want to speak to section 2 of the member for Durham West's resolution. I believe that he is correct: There should be no loss of wetland function and no net loss of acreage in Ontario. There is little doubt that an examination of the adequacy of government laws and policies and programs for ensuring protection would be useful. However, it seems to me to be obvious that the priority that is being placed on this issue in the public sector in fact is behind the demands that are being made from the public. I think the current minister ought to see those demands for what they are and bring forward the strategy so that we can get on with the job.

I think as well, as we review the question of no net loss, that what we have to review are the competing factors surrounding those issues: How do you deal with the need to protect food and raise livestock without infringing on wetland areas? How can those be made complementary? How do you preserve wetlands while still providing for the housing needs of an expanding urban population? How do you determine which wetlands have specific priority? Many have been designated as matters of international and national interest. Certainly provincial interest in many areas has been defined, and areas of local interest. There is a hierarchy for areas. How do we continue to ensure that the hierarchy is established and maintained at all levels, no matter what the interest, whether it is international or local?

I think the other question we should be looking at is what lengths we should go to to restore wetlands or to recreate a natural habitat for endangered species. I am concerned about whether our priority should in fact be to concentrate on protecting what we have rather than perhaps moving the other way. I think that would be a very useful contribution to the debate.

1140

I would also like to suggest that the committee could look at how we bring areas of jurisdictional interests together so that there is a melding of interests, whether it be the Ministry of Natural Resources, conservation authorities or whatever other body deals with these issues. We need a comprehensive wetland strategy. I compliment the member on his work.

Mr Villeneuve: I too want to spend a few minutes to participate in this debate.

I am, to some degree, disappointed that the Minister of Agriculture and Food is not here this morning, because I think this bill, both directly and indirectly, will adversely affect many farming operations.

I can cite examples that we have nuisance beaver across the province of Ontario. This bill intends and purports to promote the creation of new wetlands. To the member whose private bill we are discussing this morning, we have beavers, that are doing exactly that. They are not only flooding farm land; they are flooding some very good land on which trees are growing. If you allow that to occur for any length of time and you have already killed the trees that are on there, you have created wetlands. There is no doubt about it. The beavers, as I know them—and I speak from firsthand experience because we have to destroy dams on an annual basis—do know where to put them where they are the most effective of all.

The other area of great concern is the desirability of establishing a provincial office for wetlands protection. In other words, we would have bog or swamp cops. I think the Ministry of Natural Resources, indeed, could improve some of the ways it operates to be more effective without creating an additional bureaucracy, and also in so doing, I am sure, could slow down the process whenever we have flooding coming from nuisance beavers, that farmers would probably have to go through this swamp or bog police office. If indeed it takes as much time as some of the other ministries do to make a decision and then to put it into action, I can tell you that farmers would be lacking income tremendously.

I want to quote, from the most recent edition of *Farm and Country*, one of the headline stories, "Protected Wildlife Attacks Farm Income," and it speaks of George Lunan, who resides along the St Lawrence River between Glen Walter and Summerstown in Glengarry county, where he says he loses from between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a year to deer doing damage, particularly to his dwarf apple trees.

We have in Bruce county a man called Ken Kelly, who says the balance of wildlife has been upset by Ministry of Natural Resources policies. This man farms at Paisley, and he says that trapping restrictions have led to an overabundance of coyotes in Bruce county, drastically reducing the yearling deer population. They, of course, feed on that. Mr Kelly is not very kind when he says, "The swamp lovers and tree huggers are prevailing over common sense and reason," and that tends to have some degree of truth. I would be very, very nervous to implement the bill as it is presented this morning.

Of course we know that wetlands are most important. They recharge the hydrological system in certain areas,

and in certain areas it is an outlet for the surplus underground water and it acts as a filter and it is very much essential to life. However, common sense must prevail, and once we set in bureaucracies that are almighty, it tends to have the minorities taken for granted, and I speak of those people in rural Ontario who try and earn a living at agriculture, which is not easy in this day and age.

The article goes on to state: "The problem here is that no one seems to know the rules. Farmers are allowed to destroy beaver dams but they are not allowed to destroy the beavers." You hire a backhoe if you are able to get to the dam, and if you are not then you have got to get somebody to dynamite it, but it will be back up in the next day or two. That creates a major problem out in rural Ontario.

"Predators are not the only source of trouble," says Alfred Vogel, a corn farmer in Glengarry county. "The beaver dams are blocking municipal drains, they are killing off a lot of our good timber stands and indeed creating havoc."

I think the member brings this private member's bill to the House with all sorts of good intentions; however, I think it has to be looked at very, very closely. AMO, for example, has a report here asking for more local municipal autonomy. The ivory towers are running things and they do not always bring common sense to the situation.

I have a number of other editorial comments. They basically speak of a commonsense approach by the Ministry of the Environment, by the Ministry of Natural Resources, and of course the affected ministry, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, and the 2.5% producers across the province of Ontario will be bearing the brunt of such things as this private member's bill should it go through. There is an environmental bill of rights on the horizon that will again create all sorts of problems for our people in rural Ontario trying to earn a living and who feed this province very well.

Mr White: I rise to speak in favour of the resolution put forth by my colleague the member for Durham West. In areas such as ours, where the pressures of development are strong and we are in danger of losing any separation between our urban and natural areas—presently in my riding there are two beautiful wetland areas, quite large ones, which border Lake Ontario. These marshes are constantly threatened, as they are fragile environments. Ironically, these fertile, supportive environments with abundant flora and fauna could easily be devastated simply because of their proximity to our communities.

Separation means that they be protected from that devastation. Separation of these few remaining natural environments means that they can be appreciated, that our children will have a natural legacy that will be accessible and intact. My children and I have often walked along the shores of these marshes. We have often enjoyed the rich variety of plants and of birds and seen many other naturalists there, including Dr Suzuki. My older two explore on their own, while the youngest is often in delight at the minutiae of natural life. I am constantly amazed at the quiet respect that they accord and at the awe that they show the natural world. They are splendid times, but not just for children. We adults also regain a sense of agape

that only this natural communion can bring. As my wife would say, nature can sustain and console as no human artifice can ever hope to do.

Just as the wetlands need separation from urban encroachment in order to survive, so we as citizens need a separation from urban travails that only wetlands and other natural spaces can afford us. Likewise, it is important that our development allow for separation and preservation of natural space that is accessible here and not in preserves for the wealthy that are hundreds of miles removed from our cities. As the Crombie commission recently pointed out, even the GTA has a natural context and is in a natural environment.

In the town of Whitby, which I have the honour of representing, there are massive developments presently being planned which border upon one of these large marshes. These developments include a prestige industrial site, institutional redevelopment of the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital, other institutions, high- and low-density development for some 14,000 people, and commercial sites. Care has been taken in the planning process to ensure that there will be as little runoff as possible and that the area directly bordering the marshes will be given additional protection and in fact be in a created conservation area. The care that has been taken to produce an effective environmental management plan should be commended. Equally, the work that local volunteers and natural activists contributed should be commended. Their work ensured that these wetlands would not be neglected in the planning process.

1150

In our area of the province a great deal of attention has been devoted to this issue. In Durham, the Crombie commission heard many submissions and a great public concern regarding the preservation of our wetlands and natural environment. Both the member for Durham West and I presented before that commission. That commission came down with several preliminary recommendations regarding wetland preservation.

I think it is incumbent upon us to ensure that such care is taken throughout our great province. Our provincial government should take the lead by ensuring the adequacy of the protection of wetlands. The people of this province have expressed these concerns in many ways and on many occasions. We need to take effective leadership in conservation and environmental protection. We have a clear mandate to do so. I urge the members present to support my friend's resolution and to give it the full weight of this assembly.

Mr G. Wilson: I am pleased to rise in support of the resolution by my colleague the member for Durham West. I think he should be congratulated on initiating a well-informed debate that I think bodes well for the work of the committee in focusing this issue so that we can get the needed legislation to protect our wetland watersheds.

I want to make the point that probably all areas of the province need this kind of legislation. Certainly our area, the Kingston and greater Kingston area, is no exception. We have class 1 and class 2 wetlands that are under threat by development. It is ironic that one of the, I guess, most

prominent areas to view the watershed is seen from Highway 401, and I certainly want to welcome members of the Legislature to the Kingston area to view the greater Cataraqui watershed from Highway 401. But it highlights the need to make sure that the development that occurs in these areas is done in a sensitive way that will preserve the watersheds, as many of our colleagues have said, for not only their environmental value but for the heritage that they represent for coming generations.

There are a couple of points I want to highlight, though, in the member for Durham West's resolutions including the need for co-ordination. Several members have already said that there are area councils, for instance, working at cross-purposes in trying to bring development to their area that affects this watershed, and that the wetlands, of course, do not pay heed to the boundaries we draw. They involve several of the ridings, and the co-ordination that has to occur among the various levels of government is essential here.

The second point is the need to expand the wetlands to include the marginal areas; that we cannot have development going right to the edge of the wetlands, because that will damage them just as much as development occurring within them. So there has to be some kind of marginal buffer area of about 100 metres at least, to make sure that the wetlands are preserved in as much a natural state as possible.

I think, then, that raises the question of education, which the resolution also raises as its fourth point. As already has been mentioned, there are conservation authorities working in this area. Certainly the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority has been doing very good work in our area to further the cause of making people aware of what the wetlands include, but this should extend to the schools as well, schools at all levels, so that our citizens will be aware of the need for preservation of the wetlands.

With those points, I would like to, again, congratulate the member for Durham West for his all-encompassing resolution and wish the committee good luck in its focusing on this issue so we can get the legislation that is necessary to preserve our wetlands.

Mr Wiseman: I would like to review some of the comments that were made. The member for Timiskaming raised a very good point. I have absolutely no objection whatsoever to having the wetlands expanded to look at all of Ontario. I believe that we must take a long, hard look at the James Bay wetlands and how they fit into the ecosystem of Ontario. I believe he raised some other very good points about class 1 and 2 wetlands. I would hope that the committee would take a look at the criteria that go into defining what a wetland is, with a view to perhaps expanding those criteria to make them even more encompassing so they would catch with a broader net and protect even more wetlands.

I am also pleased that this resolution has sparked some debate. I would like to return to a couple of points made by the member for Halton Centre. As usual, she makes some well-thought-out and pointed comments. The notion of exploring northern Ontario, again, I have no problems with that. The idea of competition, what is in competition with

wetlands, and to review how the competition is impacting on wetlands is a very real point, because the three examples I have put in from my own riding speak to that competition. The Altona forest, for example, is the watershed for the creeks in the area and it is now being proposed for massive subdivision development which will, of course, change the watershed as it exists. Frenchman's Bay has always been under pressure and is now under pressure again from silting up, from upstream development and from developers who want to put townhouses right on the bay and close to the wetlands. Carruthers Creek, I mentioned earlier about a subdivision and also a marina, and also in my riding is Duffin Creek. All of these watersheds are under impact, because you cannot just look at the wetlands in a narrow definition. It is a broad, watershed definition, and I think the member for Halton Centre has raised that point and has made some very good input to this debate.

Also, we have the competition of livestock, of farming, and how do we balance that? But I think what we need to do, as the member for S-D-G & East Grenville has shown, is make sure that when we examine the issue we do take a look at the ecological balance that is necessary. I think the Brundtland report and subsequent reports that have come out have told us that we have to strike that balance. There is no alternative now; we cannot continue to go down one road, so we must look and say that we are all within an ecosystem and ask how we can make that ecosystem work in its most efficient and best way.

To the member for Simcoe East, I had the opportunity to peruse his comments from the 1986 debate. Again, he has raised some excellent points, very good questions, and I think that he has contributed to the discussion this morning, which I found very valuable. I agree with him we must look at class 1 and 2 farm lands: What are they, how do they fit into the ecosystem, and what are we going to do with them?

In closing, I would like to comment just briefly on two points, and that is the ecosystem and on how I see the debate proceeding. The Crombie commission talks very forcefully and directly about us looking at our entire ecology in an ecosystem way, that we are dependent, one spe-

cies upon the other, for survival. I had the honour of making a presentation to the Crombie commission, as did my learned friend the member for Durham Centre. I have shared a stage with Mr Crombie and he speaks eloquently of this need for discussion among the various levels of government and for concrete proposals and for concrete, clearly defined legislation or guidelines that will direct our development in these areas.

In closing, I would like to say that I do not see this debate as being just one more debate going down the road. I really feel sincerely that this committee and the work of this committee should kick off a movement towards creating legislation that has clear definitions and clearly defines the direction that we want to take in this very important environmental issue.

In closing, I would like to thank all of the speakers for their participation in this debate. I will review Hansard, because I feel the questions they raised are important and excellent questions that we should look at in terms of defining the legislation in the future.

POWERS OF ATTORNEY AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

The Deputy Speaker: Mr Sterling has moved second reading of Bill 7.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for standing committee on administration of justice.

NATURAL DEATH ACT, 1990

The Deputy Speaker: Mr Sterling has moved second reading of Bill 8.

Motion agreed to.

Bill ordered for standing committee on administration of justice.

WETLAND PROTECTION

The Deputy Speaker: Mr Wiseman has moved resolution 10.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed at 1204.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CHILD CARE CENTRES

Mrs Sullivan: Long before this government was in a position of making decisions, it stated, "New Democrats would ensure decent wages for those who care for our most vital resource—our children." It is obvious to me and to the people of Ontario that they no longer hold that view.

The Minister of Community and Social Services has made that blatantly clear in her recent pay equity announcement, which discriminates against people employed in commercial day care centres. This is a government that talks about fairness and equity. What is fair or equal when a government deliberately sets out to undermine a certain sector of our workforce?

In Halton, my area, seven out of 10 children from birth to five years old who are in child care are placed in commercial centres. Close to 40% of those children receive subsidized care. Where will these children be placed when commercial centres are forced to close? The approach of this government makes that inevitable. Operators of commercial centres in my area tell me they will be out of business in three to five years. The investment they have made in the community will go with them. People who work in those centres, mainly women, will be put out of work.

My party supports future investment in the non-profit sector, but demands that the vitality of the existing commercial sector be protected and maintained. The Premier has said he would work for all of the people of Ontario. It is clear that he meant all of the people except those people, mostly women, who work in commercial child care centres.

HUNTING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr McLean: My statement concerns the recent decision by the Minister of Natural Resources to allow unrestricted native hunting and fishing in Algonquin Provincial Park.

Let me begin by saying there is no doubt in my mind that we have a substantial debt to repay to the members of the first nations. That is a fact that I do not, and in all good conscience cannot, argue with. However, I do object to the minister making this decision without involving all interested parties in native resource agreement negotiations with this government, as he promised. I do object to his decision when he is withholding the Algonquin Provincial Park master plan, which was supposed to be released last fall. I do object to a decision that was made in advance of hunting, fishing and land claim negotiations with the Algonquins of Golden Lake, which are not scheduled to get under way under 15 June at the earliest.

As I said earlier, I do not object to repaying the debt we owe the members of the first nations, but I do object to a government that does not keep its promises, withholds important documents and then makes an arbitrary decision that will jeopardize Algonquin park's environmental integrity. I

say to the minister that by not keeping his promise of extensive consultation he has threatened Algonquin park's role in providing a wide range of tourism and recreational opportunities, its contribution to the social and economic life of the region and the protection of its unique historical and natural values. I hope that the concerns I have raised and the public outcry generated by the minister's ruling will result in his reversing his decision.

SHELTER FOR WOMEN

Mr O'Connor: I rise today to support and applaud the efforts of CADA, the Community Against Domestic Abuse committee. This is a committee of the Georgina Community Resource Centre that was formed to establish a shelter for victims of domestic violence in the Georgina area of York region. This shelter is critically needed. There is only one shelter for abused women in all of York region, and that shelter is over 50 kilometres away from Georgina.

The Georgina area has witnessed a very dramatic increase in violent episodes involving women and children. This area has the highest incidence of domestic violence in all of York region. Families are suffering a great deal and CADA has a group of dedicated service providers and community residents determined to provide a shelter for these women and children right in Georgina.

I am pleased that the government of Ontario has provided initial funding of up to \$5,000 for this shelter to allow the committee to complete its submission, to access the capital funds under Canada Mortgage and Housing's Project Haven program.

The plan for the shelter is for approximately 12 beds to service a population of 25,000 people, which includes service to the native people living on and off the reserve.

I am pleased to support the CADA group in its efforts to obtain this shelter for battered women and their children in the Georgina area. It has been my great privilege to commend them for their very hard work. We can all be proud of the dedication of the members of the Community Against Domestic Abuse committee and of all the staff of the Georgina Community Resource Centre for their outstanding efforts in prevention of wife assault through community education and this shelter for domestic violence victims.

COMMUNITY POLICE CENTRES

Mr McGuinty: On Tuesday of this week, I had the pleasure of attending the opening of an Ottawa community police centre in my riding. This is the second in a series of four and possibly more community police centres to be opened in Ottawa and Vanier.

With Chief Flanagan acting as their catalyst, the Ottawa police have developed a comprehensive and innovative plan to establish the concept of community policing in their jurisdiction. The community police centre is an integral part of this plan. Each centre, located in a different community, serves not only to allow our police to stimulate the development of the traditional neighbourhood crime prevention programs but, more important, it enables

our police and the neighbourhood community to work as a team to solve local problems.

The structure of the community police centre is made up of a civilian committee and an Ottawa police inspector who is supported both by a constable assigned to the centre and a beat officer to work the streets adjoining the centre.

I am pleased to report that our community police centres have been extremely well received by our communities and that the number of volunteers has greatly exceeded the most optimistic expectations. In addition, over \$120,000 in cash donations and equipment has been donated to the Ottawa police to assist them to open and equip the community centres.

On behalf of the people of Ottawa South and, if I may be so bold, on behalf of the people of the cities of Ottawa and Vanier, I congratulate Chief Flanagan, the Ottawa police, our police services board and our community volunteers who have participated in the creation of a project which makes tremendous gains in advancing the cause of peace and security in our neighbourhoods. I commend this project to all of the members of this House and to their communities.

EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: The Corporate Higher Education Forum is an organization of senior business executives and the presidents of a number of Canadian universities.

Forum members believe that Canada and individual Canadians stand to benefit from an informed and extensive debate about educational values, goals, means and models. They also believe that the place to start is with our schools, the foundation of lifelong learning.

Over the last couple of years, forum members have become increasingly integrated and concerned about the quality of education at the primary and secondary levels in Canada. The forum recently published an advisory, titled *To Be Our Best, Learning for the Future*, which provides some background on the quality of education together with the views of forum members and suggested actions which business people may take.

The forum makes a number of recommendations. I would like to emphasize recommendation 3, which states, "That students, their parents and all constituents of the communities in which they live must come to recognize that education is the key to meeting the challenges and seizing the opportunities of a knowledge-based society."

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the forum for their hard work in producing this report. I urge the ministers associated with this report to take a serious look at its recommendations and I look forward to discussing them with them.

We are very fortunate in Canada to have this kind of forum that shows such leadership. I hope we will take advantage of their good advice.

SIGNS OF HOPE CONFERENCE

Mr Waters: I am pleased to have an opportunity to inform the House about a conference on education and the environment that will take place in Huntsville on 15 April.

The Muskoka Environmental Educators Association has done an excellent job of arranging an impressive array of workshops, displays and speakers. The conference theme and title, *Signs of Hope*, rests on the belief that knowledge and commitment from educators and students in the present will have a positive impact on the future of our environment.

The keynote speaker will be Dr David Suzuki, a prominent environmentalist of world renown, who will bring a message of hope to humankind and will respond adequately to our ecological predicament. Author and journalist Warner Troyer and Chief Gary Potts, as well as 30 other distinguished speakers, will make representations.

I ask all members of the House to join me in support of the *Signs of Hope* conference on 15 April in Huntsville, for together we can become part of the solution.

1340

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Phillips: Mr Speaker, I think I speak on behalf of many members in the House that I think we can do a better job in question period. I will be sending you some recommendations on how I think we might improve the productivity of question period. As I am sure you have probably noticed, each time the opposition asks a question of the government on action, we tend to get one of, I think, five standard responses, and they are the same responses each time.

Perhaps to make question period more productive, Mr Speaker, why do we not simply have you get a copy of these five standard answers and have them provided to each of the members of the House. The minister who is being questioned simply needs to respond by quoting the number of the appropriate standard answer. I think we could greatly speed up the proceedings and save the embarrassment all around of hearing the same answer repeated over and over again. To give you an example, Mr Speaker, I think I have written down the standard answers.

The first one is on inaction for the Agenda For People. This, I think, is the Treasurer's own answer. This is the one that we suggest he use and it goes something like this: We ask a question on the Agenda for People. The minister simply says it is answer 1 and we read the answer. It says: "Surely the member can appreciate that when we prepared the Agenda for People we had all the answers because we didn't know exactly what we were doing. Now that we know what we're doing, we don't know what the answers are."

I think that was the Treasurer's response, but I have suggested the other four standard answers and I appreciate your consideration, Mr Speaker.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mr Tilson: Yesterday a consultant's report was released that indicated Ontario had a dire shortage of affordable housing. It went on to recommend that the Ontario government construct 27,000 non-profit and co-operative housing units. If the government proceeds, it will cost \$3 billion to build the units and another \$298 million in annual operating subsidies over 35 years.

All three parties recognize that Ontario has a rental housing crisis on its hands, but we contend that the current situation has been created by government regulation of the housing market. As a result of rent controls, the private sector no longer builds rental accommodation; the taxpayer is financing virtually every new unit that is being built.

The Liberals committed \$3 billion to construct 30,000 units under the Homes Now program, with an additional \$300 million in annual operating subsidies over 35 years. As the Homes Now, Project 3000 and Project 3600 units come on stream, operating subsidies will reach over \$875 million by 1993-94 with a mature annual cost of \$1 billion, an increase of over 300% from the Ministry of Housing's 1985-86 budget of \$243 million. These skyrocketing costs are all before the Treasurer allocates an additional \$3 billion.

We cannot afford to build every rental unit in this province. The NDP must recognize that taxpayers have been pushed to their limits. We must work with the private sector to build additional rental housing stock. I urge the government to rethink Bill 4. It will only make things worse.

EMPLOYMENT EQUITY

Mr Malkowski: This morning I saw with much disgust and dismay a cartoon on page 10 of the Toronto Sun depicting a blind police officer on the workforce. It is reprehensible that any media would allow material for publication demeaning the efforts of employment equity and all that it stands for. This is particularly a profound and offensive insult to the blind people who do not even have the advantage of seeing this pictorial for themselves.

The concept of employment equity is to assist disabled people to participate fully in society and change the negative attitudes which have been too long-standing. Employment equity is a concept which removes employment barriers; identifies and removes discriminatory policies and practices; seeks the goal of fair representation for all Ontarians and Canadians, in particular women, aboriginals, disabled persons and visible minorities; and promotes economic development through the full utilization of talents of all people.

This is a human rights issue, a non-partisan issue. Affirmative action should be addressed in an affirmative fashion. We are all proud that affirmative action is represented here in this House and is a positive model of this concept, and I would encourage all members of this House to express their views and demand that the Toronto Sun make a public apology immediately.

TIME ALLOCATION

The Speaker: Yesterday, the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the House leader for the third party both presented a point of order with respect to the government notice of motion 16, which appears on the order paper under the name of the government House leader.

I would like to thank them, as well as the other members who contributed to these points, for their thoughtful and well-presented arguments. I have had time to consider them and I will now give my ruling on both points.

The point of order raised by the honourable Leader of the Opposition is an important one. He and others have argued that because of our notice provisions the House has, in a certain way, been taken by surprise by the government House leader's notice of motion.

The rule of notice is one that is found in various applications in most Parliaments and its purpose is clearly to make sure that members of the House should not be surprised by a measure being proposed to them and for which they would not have had time to prepare to debate adequately.

Until 1970 in the Ontario Legislature, the rule that applied to notice was the following:

"Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address; for the appointment of any committee; or for the putting of a question; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of the meeting or adjournment of the House; such notices to be laid on the table before 5 o'clock pm, and to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings of that day."

Members will have noticed that this rule specified that two days' notice had to be given for substantive motions.

In 1970, this House decided to change that rule, and it is the one that guides us presently and reads as follows:

"All notices required by the standing orders of the House or otherwise shall be laid on the table or filed with the Clerk of the House before 5 pm and printed on the Orders and Notices paper for the following day."

What happened in 1970 was that the House decided to remove one of the days that applied to notice. It is also important to point out in this matter that our standing orders prescribe only one rule with regard to notice and does not distinguish between various types of substantive motions.

In the House of Commons in Ottawa, they have kept the two days' required notice for substantive motions, but in giving themselves a specific standing order related to allocation of time, they have seen the necessity of only one day's notice being required.

In this case the Chair has no alternative but to find that according to our standing orders, the notice of motion on the order paper is in order. Under standing order 51 it requires only one day's notice, that is to say, it must be filed before 5 o'clock the previous day, and on the first day that it appears in the Orders and Notices it can be moved. If there was to be a change to this, it would have to come about in the normal way that changes are made to the standing orders, that is, by a motion brought before the House in order to amend the standing orders.

The second point of order, that raised by the honourable member for Parry Sound, is also a very serious point, especially in a House that does not have a codified time allocation procedure.

While considering all of the arguments raised and comparing them with the precedents created by this House since 1982, I have found that no really new arguments were raised yesterday that had not previously been dealt with by my predecessors in my chair.

A time allocation motion is a valid procedure. It attaches itself to a specific subject matter before the House

and stipulates how it shall be dealt with. It is in the form of a motion which is fully debatable under our rules, and once it is passed, constitutes an order of the House stating now a certain piece of legislation is to be further studied. Notice of motion 16, presently before the House, is in order and conforms in every way with the practices and precedents of this House.

1350

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

WAGE PROTECTION

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I am pleased to tell the members that I will be bringing forward today the government's employee wage protection program. This program represents a major achievement in strengthening the rights of workers in Ontario. It is in difficult economic times such as we are experiencing today that we have to increase protection for workers and ensure that they do not become victims of circumstances they cannot control. This program, set out in the Agenda for People and announced by the Premier in October, forms an integral part of our government's comprehensive approach to labour adjustment. It will allow workers owed money to reclaim that money in a timely and efficient way.

The employee wage protection program will be one of three major amendments to the Employment Standards Act which I will be introducing today. First, as the Premier promised last October, we are establishing a program that will cover workers whose employers have failed to pay wages, vacation, severance and termination pay. Second, in cases where an employer does not or cannot pay, we will amend the Employment Standards Act to enable employees, or the government on their behalf, to obtain the money owed to them from the directors and officers of the company by extending the liabilities that presently exist under the Ontario Business Corporations Act. Finally, we are establishing new, quicker appeals procedures for both workers and employers to deal with all aspects of the Employment Standards Act.

I would like to give the members the details of these amendments that we are proposing.

Ontario's employee wage protection program will be retroactive to cover workers affected since 1 October 1990, the day this government took office.

The employment standards branch of my ministry has already received more than 12,000 potential claims for compensation from workers since the Premier announced our intention to create this program. These workers are unable to collect their earned wages and other entitlements due to their employer's insolvency, closure or simple failure to pay.

Considering the severity of the current recession, my ministry officials estimate that in the first 18 months of the employee wage protection program, more than 50,000 workers will benefit. Employees qualified for compensation from the program will be able to collect earned wages, vacation, severance and termination pay to a maximum of \$5,000. We feel that the \$5,000 in compensation for wages and other earned entitlement does provide a substantial

measure of protection, especially to the most vulnerable workers in the province.

Even with this \$5,000 ceiling, we estimate the cost of the program to be some \$175 million in the first 18 months of coverage. In addition, the legislation does allow the government to increase the maximum compensation from time to time through changes in the regulations.

It is our intention to have the employee wage protection program operating as soon as possible following the proclamation of this legislation. The government hopes for full co-operation from all members of the House to ensure speedy and expeditious passage.

When the employee wage protection program is operational, employees who have been unsuccessful in obtaining wages or other money owed them by their employer will file a claim with the employment standards branch, as is the current practice. These claims will then be investigated for validity, once again, as is the current practice.

Presently, where the employer is insolvent, it is often impossible to collect the money owing, despite the best efforts of the branch. With the establishment of the employee wage protection program, when entitlement is established, employees will be compensated from the program, even if the employer is insolvent and unable to pay.

If, for whatever reason, a solvent employer does not meet his or her obligations, those affected employees will also have access to the program.

The amendments I am announcing today will also provide for enhanced enforcement. We will take the liability that currently exists under the Ontario Business Corporations Act for directors' responsibilities for debts, extend it to officers, and apply it to the Employment Standards Act. Officers and directors may be liable for up to six months' wages and twelve months' vacation pay.

Because of these changes, officers and directors will have a three-month grace period from the effective date of the legislation to obtain liability insurance if they wish to.

Finally, the amendments to the Employment Standards Act will create new, more efficient appeals processes for both workers and employers. Appeals initiated by employers, directors or officers or by the director of employment standards must start within 45 days of the application, and an approved adjudication process will be set up for workers. Our new streamlined appeals process will allow workers to obtain quickly money they have earned, while providing the employers with a speedy right of appeal.

I want to emphasize that the government expects employers to continue to live up to their obligations to their employees. By setting out this legislation, we are strengthening the power of the employment standards branch to ensure that these responsibilities are carried out. In addition, we are creating the backup security that workers need to obtain the money owed them by their employers, especially in cases where the employers are unable to meet their financial responsibilities due to insolvency.

In the consultations on this legislation, workers and the employer groups agreed that wage protection measures would be of real benefit to workers by removing the uncertainty and fear of non-payment of wages, especially in

these difficult economic times. In this government, we believe it is absolutely necessary to pay people the wages they have earned for the work they have done, and we believe that these employees should be paid their money promptly, without undue or unforeseen obstacles. For these reasons, the employee wage protection program will offer workers quick recourse to their entitlements.

The wage protection program is a measure that this government is proud to introduce today. I trust we can count on the support of all members of the House to ensure that deserving employees recoup their wages as expeditiously as possible.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank the members of the ministry, the members of my own staff and legislative counsel for the large amount of work, including overtime, that they have had to do over the past weeks in preparing this particular complex piece of legislation.

BUSINESS PRACTICES

Hon Ms Churley: I wish to announce that a binding order has been issued against the Ontario Science Centre for violation of the province's Discriminatory Business Practices Act.

The action results from a ministry investigation into a contract signed between the OSC and the sultanate of Oman for the provision of a children's museum.

The binding order includes the following measures: The OSC has acknowledged it violated the Discriminatory Business Practices Act; the OSC will make public documents related to the contract with the sultanate of Oman; the OSC will not discriminate in future business practices; the OSC will revise its administrative practices and other policies and procedures to ensure compliance with the Discriminatory Business Practices Act; the OSC's board of directors must approve all future international contracts and submit them to the director responsible for the Discriminatory Business Practices Act for review before they are signed.

The investigation concluded that Mark Abbot, the director general of the centre, in 1990 signed a contract with the Sultanate of Oman which contravened the Discriminatory Business Practices Act. The board of the Ontario Science Centre was not apprised of the contents of the contract prior to its finalization. The contract was signed despite concerns raised by the lawyers in the Ministry of Culture and Communications.

The Discriminatory Business Practices Act contains a provision prohibiting a person or organization from entering into discriminatory transactions. It was passed by the Ontario Legislature in 1978.

The Ontario Science Centre incident was most unfortunate and one that serves to highlight the importance of eliminating discriminatory practices whenever they occur. I believe the decision taken in connection with this incident has been appropriate and will best serve the public interest. My ministry will monitor the situation with the Ontario Science Centre to ensure full compliance of the binding order. I am tabling in the House today a copy of the binding compliance order.

1400

COMMUNITY JUSTICE WEEK

Hon Mr Hampton: I would like to take a few moments to inform the members of the Legislature that 15 April marks the beginning of Community Justice Week in Ontario, an annual event reaching out into local communities across the province to foster understanding and involvement in the justice system. Sponsored by the Ontario ministries of the Attorney General, the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Community Justice Week demonstrates our commitment to a more accessible, more affordable, and perhaps more important, a more humane and understandable system of justice.

Understanding, having a sense of responsibility for and a desire to participate in institutions which provide legal services will only arise from concerted efforts to open and improve information to the public. Increasing public access to justice services can be achieved through improved public knowledge of those services. Community Justice Week will help to give to people a greater appreciation of how the justice system actually works in Ontario.

Discussion at the local level is also an important contribution to our efforts to ensure that the justice system is more responsive to the needs of the people and more reflective of the society it serves.

This year's theme, "Justice: We All Make It Happen," is intended to bring to the people of Ontario a sense of ownership and participation in the justice process.

Community Justice Week is being celebrated in various ways across the province. Crown attorneys, the police, correctional staff and others whose work contributes to the justice process will be meeting with groups to provide information and encourage community co-operation and involvement in the administration of justice.

The Canadian Bar Association—Ontario, for example, has organized a number of activities for Law Day, which will be held on 17 April. This year, the Ministry of the Attorney General is providing support for a number of the CBAO's activities, such as mock trial competitions in Ontario high schools, court tours for junior high school students and the association's essay contest, which is open to students in grades 10 through 13.

Highlighting this year's activities are a number of video presentations taking place throughout Ontario. Through joint sponsorship of the ministries of the Attorney General, the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, the video Just...For You will be presented to students and members of the public.

Through a fictitious case involving two young offenders who are alleged to have stolen a car, the video illustrates the various steps in the justice process by tracing the incident from the initial contact with the police, through the court system, to a view of some of the dispositions available for young offenders.

To showcase the video, there will be numerous panel presentations across the province with representatives of the three justice ministries and the CBAO fielding questions from the students after the video is shown.

By focusing on how people can help make justice happen, we hope to strengthen contact and dialogue between the justice ministries and students who may not be touched directly by the issues. By fostering a better understanding of the justice system at an early age, future generations will find the system more understandable and hence more accessible.

In keeping with the spirit of Community Justice Week, I encourage all members to participate in events held in their communities. We need everyone's co-operation to best demonstrate how we all help make justice happen in Ontario.

RESPONSES

WAGE PROTECTION

Mr Nixon: I think it is appropriate that I respond to the Minister of Labour, since I have been somewhat critical of the delays he has been responsible for in bringing forward this material. Having said that, I want to tell him we welcome it into the House and look forward to seeing the legislation and perusing it. In so far as it responds to the recommendations from the Premier's Council that were tabled last summer, we will have no trouble supporting it, but I know the minister and his colleagues will have additions to that which we will look at with care and interest.

The honourable minister is aware, of course, that while this compensation is important and much sought after, he has indicated 12,000 people have already indicated their interest by their application. Still, it does nothing to improve the provision of jobs in this province, which is a matter of serious proportions and which we deal with from time to time in question period and in the general debates here.

I was interested in the prospect of the cost, of course, with 12,000 applicants at a maximum of \$5,000 each. While there might be about \$60 million required for this interim period, he indicated that the Treasurer was probably thinking in general terms, since it is coming from the consolidated revenue fund without any other revenues earmarked to support it at this time, and that he might have to allocate as much as \$120 million. If the Treasurer's economists indicate that the recession may lengthen and deepen, naturally there would have to be even more money involved, so this is a program of some considerable proportions.

We are also interested in the way it relieves the banks and those others who would be creditors of the bankrupt companies from fulfilling their specific responsibilities. I know the minister and his colleagues would be very anxious to see that this money was going into the pockets of the working people, and not necessarily relieving any financial responsibility of those other people responsible for the financing of the bankrupt endeavours.

We will have something further to say about putting more onus on officers as well as directors. Certainly, having quicker appeals is always worth while because naturally a fair and equitable government applies both to workers and management. Anything that can speed up the ponderous aspects of the bureaucracy under the minister's control would be well worth while.

We welcome the legislation and we look forward to seeing it in print, considering it in our caucus and debating it in the House.

Mr Sorbara: Before I respond to the statement of the Attorney General, just let me remind the Minister of Labour that he needs to strengthen substantially his employment standards branch if he is going to be able to honour the commitments he has made today.

COMMUNITY JUSTICE WEEK

Mr Sorbara: In response to the statement by the Attorney General concerning Community Justice Week, let me begin by saying that the one small benefit I thought we would have as a result of the election of last 6 September was that this new, progressive NDP government would rid itself of the self-congratulatory weeks and stop making statements about what a great job it is doing. I think they are unnecessary. I thought they were unnecessary during our time in government and during the time of the Tories' government.

It is really unfortunate that the Attorney General, who has been in his office now for some seven months, can tell us no more than that we are going to, once again, for another year, celebrate Community Justice Week. His new theme is "Justice: We All Make it Happen," except for the thousands and thousands of accused who are not going to trial, whose cases are being dismissed because the courts are backlogged, the thousands and thousands of people who are finding, because of expense or because of the unavailability of legal aid, that they simply do not have access to the justice system.

My friend the Attorney General was talking about a more humane and understandable system, but he has been there for a very long time now and he has not brought in one measure that would do anything to make our system of justice more accessible. I invite him to do that. When he does that, I can tell him that Her Majesty's loyal opposition will be very anxious to hear his statement and very anxious to support his measures.

I think, for example, of the case reported just a few days ago of the sexual assault of a 12-year-old girl. That case was dismissed; it did not get to trial. There are thousands and thousands of victims out there who will not be attending his Community Justice Week because they think he has not done a good enough job.

1410

WAGE PROTECTION

Mrs Witmer: I support the need for employees to receive wages in the cases of bankruptcy and abandonment and I am pleased that this has been introduced today. However, it is also time for this government to recognize that Ontario is again leading the way. We are leading the way in the introduction of this legislation. Only Manitoba and Quebec have similar legislation at this time.

However, we are also leading the way in the loss of jobs. At this time, we have lost in this province three quarters of all job losses in Canada. One out of two employees who has lost his job has been permanently laid off. I say to the Minister of Labour, what is he doing to retain existing

jobs? Although this legislation may ease the pain of employment temporarily after the plants close, it is not going to create one single new job.

What is the minister doing to make Ontario competitive again? What is he doing to create an economic climate that encourages job creation? What initiatives will he be providing to business to move to Ontario and create new jobs in order that dependency on this fund will eventually decrease?

This is a major initiative, and I would suggest to the government that it allow sufficient time to study and analyse the impact of this proposed legislation and allow an opportunity for all those involved to be involved in the discussion.

COMMUNITY JUSTICE WEEK

Mr Harris: I want to comment on the statement by the Attorney General on behalf of the Solicitor General and those involved in the justice portfolio.

First of all, I want to congratulate and pay tribute to the member for Carleton who, back in 1982, as the Provincial Secretary for Justice, inaugurated a week as Community Justice Week. This has been an annual event since that period of time. It was 1982, when the justice ministries were co-ordinated under a Provincial Secretariat for Justice, and the left hand knew what the right hand was doing. Correctional Services knew what the Attorney General was doing and the Attorney General knew what the Solicitor General was doing and all of the ministers actually knew what was going on in their departments.

Those were the good days for justice. That was when justice was a priority of the government of the day here in Ontario. For the Attorney General to stand up today and talk about I do not know how much money—I would like to know—going into all these videos, supposedly—well, they are probably a bunch of NDP firms that affiliated with producing the videos too. As long as they affiliate and donate to the NDP, I guess they get to produce the videos; I do not know. Maybe that is why the members opposite are so sensitive.

The minister says, "This week will give people a realistic appreciation of how the justice system actually works in Ontario." Nothing could be farther from the truth. The justice system in this province is not working. We are seeing that day after day after day.

[Applause]

Mr Harris: The member can applaud for that. We are finding that the resources to the justice field are declining year after year after year, and under the Liberal administration the percentage that went to the justice field went down each and every budget year. I venture that it will go down again this year if and when the Treasurer can figure out when he is going to bring in his budget. Because of the lack of resources the police have, the bottom line of it is that the odds of getting caught are now slimmer than they are of getting away. Once you are caught, because of the Askov case, the odds of actually going to trial and being convicted are less than they are of actually coming to trial. If by chance you beat the odds and you are found guilty, the penalty is you get to play volleyball.

ORAL QUESTIONS

JOB SECURITY

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Premier pertaining to the sale of de Havilland announced yesterday. I would like to ask him about the situation where the Premier or the government announced a special committee to review this matter, a working group chaired by the Deputy Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology himself, a very competent person who has the confidence of the government and many people in this House, probably everybody, and yet this went forward under the circumstances that, according to the union representatives, 1,700 jobs will be lost and a recourse to research and development might very well be impaired.

During the two months that this working group was in operation, I understand they reported to the Premier and some members of cabinet at least once. Can the Premier report what their recommendations were in this regard, whether they now favour the sale and, if not, what recommendations they have given to him and the government to stop the sale of de Havilland to these foreign interests and how can we save these jobs?

Hon Mr Rae: I know that all the members of the House, and I certainly know the Leader of the Opposition, would share what I think is a fundamental concern of the people of this province, and that is that a company which has contributed as much as de Havilland has and will in the future must receive all the attention and focus that it can for its future. We believe there is a strong future for de Havilland in the province of Ontario, that there are not only new jobs, but high-tech jobs, well-paid jobs, that will produce exports and that will be long-term jobs in the province, that can and will be there. We are going to do everything we can to see that is exactly what happens.

Mr Bradley: Consumers' Gas, Varsity.

Hon Mr Rae: I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition very directly, in answer to his question, first of all, that the working group which he has referred to consists of members of the government, members of the business community who on a voluntary basis have contributed their time to giving us advice—both Mr Blundell and Mr Corcoran, who are very senior and helpful, have been very, very helpful in our work—as well as members of the trade union involved who obviously have a very strong stake in the future of the company, and Mr Pecaut, who is with the Canada Consulting Group which was very much involved with the previous Premier's Council, so I am sure he is familiar with his work and capabilities. The working group is still very much at work. They are obviously waiting, as we all are, for any particular details of the sale and the nature of the contract that has been signed between ATR and Boeing.

But I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that the direct answer to his question is no. The working group has not, under any shape or form, approved of the deal. They have not even seen it. Certainly, all the advice I have received from the working group so far has been to stress the importance of this company and these jobs to the province and to Canada—not just to Ontario but to the whole

country. I would remind the Prime Minister of that simple fact of life when it comes to these jobs and say to the Leader of the Opposition that we are going to be doing everything we can in a constructive and positive way to see that these jobs and this company have as strong and as creative a future as is humanly possible.

1420

Mr Nixon: I believe I heard the Premier this morning on CBC. He said he had some reliance on Investment Canada' and that its feet should be held to the fire. I am not sure that that is the exact quote, but there was an indication that he felt they were going to do something about it, although, as you would know, Mr Speaker, Investment Canada has reviewed 900 takeovers since took its responsibilities four years ago, and has stopped none of them. So there is not really much to hope for there.

However, the Premier, on the first day of the last election campaign, went out to de Havilland, which was an appropriate backdrop for some fairly strong statements, although he did back off when he said he was not a socialist that day, for some reason, as I recall. He went so far as to say he would support government ownership of the plant if that was required to save the jobs.

Now, it is interesting that he, through this question period, has sent a message to the Prime Minister of Canada indicating the importance of this business to Ontario and Canada, because the Prime Minister of Canada used their question period to send a message to this Premier. Yesterday, the Prime Minister said that he "would entertain very seriously an offer from the government of Ontario to take over the de Havilland operation."

I think we should be aware that de Havilland received \$1 billion in government grants over the period of its development. The government of Canada then sold it to Boeing for \$60 million and gave Boeing about \$150 million in grants. In other words, they paid Boeing to take it off their hands even though its capability is world-renowned.

This is a very difficult situation for us all, but I would suggest that the Premier's feet are getting a bit toasted at the present time. He said he would take it over. The Prime Minister said he would seriously consider a move by the Premier to take over de Havilland. I wonder if he would clarify his thinking in this important matter at this time.

Hon Mr Rae: I will be glad to, and I will be glad to very directly.

I think the comment the Prime Minister made yesterday with respect to these jobs shows an insensitivity to a company that is profoundly important to the future of this country and of our economy. I say to all members of the House that this is not a moment in which the government of Canada should be turning its back on the workers at de Havilland or on the company or on the research and development future of this province. This is a moment when the government of Canada should understand that these workers deserve attention and deserve some understanding, as well as others in the country. That is what we expect from the Prime Minister of Canada.

I can simply tell the Leader of the Opposition this: this government, on the advice of the working group, which is

going to be looking very intensely at exactly what is being proposed by the consortium as well as what alternatives are there—there may be other purchasers, there may be other partnerships; all of these things are possible and all of these things will be discussed. But I say to the member that the Prime Minister of Canada and Investment Canada have a responsibility to the workers of this country and have a responsibility to jobs and science and technology, and so do we. We intend to live up to our responsibilities and I hope that Brian Mulroney lives up to his.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, interjections have already brought to our attention the position taken by the Premier in allowing Varsity to leave Canada and go to Buffalo after he made a statement in that regard, and they remember his position on Consumers' Gas, having been stated clearly, and that was sold out to foreign interests.

Now, Ontario has a great responsibility here and the Prime Minister, I suppose, is being unfair when he remembers that the Premier said that to save the jobs he would contemplate taking over de Havilland. A very extreme step indeed. And probably it may be irresponsible and extreme for the Prime Minister to add to his answer in the House of Commons something that did not have much to do with the question, that he would take the Premier's offer seriously.

I do not know whether the workers are caught in a bit of cross-fire here or not, but I am afraid that as both these first ministers back away from their responsibilities, those 1,600 workers may find that there is no one left to speak for them.

Now, there is a very strong quote from the Premier about Investment Canada. He said, "Investment Canada's reputation is riding on its ability to maintain and develop de Havilland in Ontario." We know the federal government's record. They put \$1 billion in this. We know that Investment Canada is a weak reed, probably a useless reed. Perhaps the only hope these workers have and that Ontario has is that the government of Ontario come forward with a workable, usable plan, hopefully in conjunction with the government of Canada, and not taking long-range political shots between the socialists and the arch-Tories in Ottawa.

I would like the Premier to try once again, realizing many people are watching, but let's be serious about this: What can he do, other than berate the government of Canada, and perhaps, God forbid, repeat what he did with Varsity and Consumers'?

Hon Mr Rae: If the House will permit, and if the Leader of the Opposition will permit, I will try to give him as clear an answer as I can. What we will do is based already on what we have done, and let me remind the House of what we have done. As the plans for a sale were announced, and as it became clear to us that these negotiations were proceeding, we brought together a group, a group of business people, a group of workers, government people and outside consultants who know something about the industry. I have met with a number of people, as well as with the working group, in terms of looking at what other alternatives there might be and how serious those business alternatives really are. I can tell the Leader of the

Opposition that I intend to work with that group and intend to work with the government of Canada and with anyone else on a non-partisan, non-ideological basis to ensure the future of that company.

My concern about the comments of the Prime Minister yesterday was that he talked about this as some great foreign investment. ATR is going to be sending a cheque to Seattle, Washington, and that is not what I would call new investment creating new jobs in the province of Ontario. So it is important for us as a government to recognize that there are some very practical, hard-headed things we can do in making the kind of assessment of the company, in providing assistance to those who want to make other kinds of offers and in making the strongest possible case to the federal government and to Investment Canada as to what is required for a deal to be done which will in fact be in the best interests of all the people of the country. That is the test, that is the law, and that is exactly what this government intends to do.

The Speaker: New question.

Mr Nixon: In the case of Varity and Consumers', the Premier had the means to stop the sales, but still the interests were sold out to foreign interests. Perhaps that is the test that should give us the most concern.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, if I may. The minister will be aware of the findings of the Conference Board of Canada survey which shows that Ontario is bearing the brunt of this recession. Some indications are that the unemployment increase is twice as large in this province as in any other province and in general almost twice as large as the unemployment increase in the rest of Canada, excluding Ontario. The report noted that in 1981 and 1982, 118,000 jobs were lost, and in the last year, 226,000 jobs were lost. Comparing the recession at the beginning of the decade of the 1980s with the one now in Ontario, it is twice as bad here now as it was then, and as I pointed out in the first part of my preamble, if they will permit, it is twice as bad here now as it is elsewhere.

Does the minister have a specific plan to use the responsibility of his office and the budget that he presently has, plus any additions that the Treasurer may make available in the next few weeks, not just to help those people who have lost their jobs, which we all agree is important, but to see that we can start the growth of the Ontario economy again and create new jobs which are so desperately needed?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I suppose if I start to respond to the question by laying much of the fault on the fiscal policies of the federal government, it will evoke a rather loud response from the members opposite, but I must in fact do exactly that. If they do not care to listen to the claims from this side as legitimate, I might quote to them, emanating from the same article that I believe is referred to, from a Mr Gignac, senior economic adviser to the National Bank of Canada, where he suggests in the context of the free trade agreement, "It is not surprising that people are going to invest elsewhere."

We have this federal free trade agreement that has hurt Ontario and much of Canada. We also have a high interest rate policy which has put Ontario industries in a very uncompetitive circumstance. We also have a very high dollar, pegged by the Bank of Canada through John Crow, and he continues, as I said yesterday, to head towards a 2% inflation factor by the year 1995, and that will create more pain, more suffering, more business closures and more unemployment in this province.

1430

We will continue, as we have in the past, to try to reshape the federal government's thinking, but we know how difficult that is, as evidenced by the previous question to the Premier with respect to de Havilland.

Beyond that, the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology will continue, through its domestic policy group, through its trade group, through its international offices, through the Premier's Council, through the very excellent work of the Ontario Development Corp, which has supported by way of loan and loan guarantees small and medium businesses in this province, to assist them in every way that we can to maintain their position as viable companies and employers in this province.

As well, we are establishing a new circumstance—

Mr Mahoney: Give him the hook. We want an answer. Interjections.

The Speaker: Yes, we appreciate brevity; supplementary.

Mr Nixon: The honourable minister had the good grace to be apologetic about blaming the federal policy since that applies all over Canada and it is twice as bad here as anywhere else. There is some sort of a lesson there. He also indicated that he had a number of structures in place to assist, but those are the same ones that were in place during the time when we were creating 700,000 jobs, not losing 1,600 jobs a day. This is special.

Can the minister not give a single indication of what he and his colleagues are doing to make Ontario more attractive for international investment, which is so seriously needed here in order to create permanent jobs in place of the jobs that are being lost?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I appreciate the admission of the Leader of the Opposition, for if they are the very same policies that he suggested were in place before that are in place now, I do not think they are policies that perhaps he should stake too much claim to.

This province, through the creation of its \$700-million anti-recession fund, through the worker protection fund and many other measures is attempting to cushion the impact on Ontario citizens who have felt the painful brunt of these federal policies.

In addition to that, we look forward to the budget at the end of this month or the beginning of next, when the Treasurer brings forward many new initiatives that this government has been working on and will establish, which will be the basis of the new strategy for Ontario development.

Mr Nixon: The Minister of Finance for Canada, like the minister who has just spoken, has also expressed his concern about the budget, and we are all interested to see what sort of an egg will be forthcoming. I would like in

fact to break the question up and direct this to the Treasurer, but I know that is not permitted.

I would like to bring the minister's attention to a statement made by the Premier, who I find has a very good statement on almost every issue that comes along. On 10 December 1982, in a situation somewhat similar to what we are now experiencing, the present Premier said:

"Does the Treasurer not understand or realize that there is a substantial and growing consensus within the business community itself that there has to be a major act of faith, optimism and investment in and through the public sector to help get the economy going?"

It is twice as bad now as it was then. What is the difference except that in those days Frank Miller had a program that was geared to the needs of the people in the community and not just designed for a little third-rate publicity? Why does the minister not come forward with programs that are going to be useful?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I am sorry I do not have a more appropriate response to the decade-old question of the Leader of the Opposition.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Solicitor General and Minister of Correctional Services. Yesterday an article appeared in the *Hamilton Spectator* alleging that the weekend inmates at the Hamilton-Wentworth Detention Centre are given credit for time that they have not served. In fact, fully two thirds, it was reported, of the intermittent inmates do not spend any time in jail at all because there is no room for them.

I would ask the minister why this situation is allowed to develop and, second, would he not agree with me that there is a terrible lack of co-ordination among the justice ministries today? Does it seem appropriate to him to suggest that judges can sentence people and allow them to serve their sentences on the weekend—obviously they have some understanding and sense that there will be a place for them and they actually will be able to serve it that way—when in fact there is no space for them and they are not serving any time at all?

Hon Mr Farnan: The leader of the third party speaks of an issue close to my heart. It is important to have an integrated justice system.

Unfortunately, over the past 10 years, through benign neglect, there was a backlog building up in the courts that was simply allowed to accumulate and grow. This was something that took place during those Conservative years, followed by the next administration, but it is a challenge for us. It is a challenge that we are determined to face and indeed the Attorney General has made some very courageous steps. New judges have been hired, the 212,000 backlog of cases is being addressed and, within Correctional Services, we are attempting to deal with the clients who are sent to our system.

This provides challenges for us, challenges that have to have creative decisions. We are having blitz courts. We are having intermittent sentencing. All of these are things we are doing to cope with the challenge ahead of us.

Mr Harris: In the meantime, these so-called clients, ie, convicted criminals, are not serving any time at all and obviously they know it. They are aware of how much of a deterrent it is if they actually get caught and somehow or other actually do come to trial and then are sentenced.

On 25 March my colleague the member for Oakville South brought to the attention of the Premier the fact that convicted criminals were playing volleyball instead of performing community service. This is another way of handling the fact that we have no room in jails. There is no room to get them in on the weekend, so we punish them by giving them community service.

The Premier at that time promised to raise the issue with the minister. We have not heard anything back since 25 March, and I would ask the minister what he has done and why he has not reported back to this House as a result of this question on the status of this con game.

Hon Mr Farnan: Again, I am delighted to answer this question. The one program the leader of the third party is speaking of was a rather unfortunate situation where in fact people on community service orders were playing volleyball. Now that was happening for seven years, under the Conservative administration and under the Liberal administration, and under the NDP we cut it out; no more, period.

1440

Mr Eves: The same guys have been playing volleyball for seven years? Is that what you said? That was the question and that was your answer.

Mr Harris: Clearly the Canadian Olympic volleyball team will want to see these people who have been practising for seven years.

The bottom line is that the minister knew nothing about this, that the justice ministries do not seem to know what one another are doing, that sentences are obviously inappropriate, because they cannot facilitate and accommodate them, and when they do, there is no follow-up, nobody knows what is going on anyway.

Yesterday my colleague the member for Leeds-Grenville was forced to raise the gruesome case of a convicted rapist serving only two months of a two-year sentence. I was away yesterday but I was shocked last night as I was reviewing the events of the day to find out that the Solicitor General was not even aware of this appalling situation.

Criminals are roaming the streets with seeming immunity while the Solicitor General and the Attorney General and the Minister of Correctional Services and those involved in justice seem to be roaming the halls. I would suggest to the members that perhaps the biggest threat to safety in our community is this government's inaction and inability to know what is really going on.

I ask the minister straightforwardly and simply—I understand now he seems to know about this case since the member for Leeds-Grenville brought it up to him—why is it that this was allowed to happen? Why is it that he did not know about this? Would he at least admit to this House that he really does not know what is going on in the justice system throughout this province?

Hon Mr Farnan: Let me just simply say that in the case of Mr Uloth, who is the individual the leader of the

third party is speaking about, a judge determined that Mr Uloth—at the time of arrest he was released from court on bail and remained in the community for seven months until he was returned to court for trial. Also, after he was released, he went to a community residential centre that has an outstanding record, and let me say that never in the past in this community residential centre has an individual who was a sex offender violated that probation at that placement.

Because of the special circumstances and the genuine community concern, I have ordered that Mr Uloth be placed at the Ontario Correctional Institute for a review to see if his placement in the community residential centre was indeed appropriate. That is in recognition of community concern.

Mr Runciman: My question is also to the Minister of Correctional Services and it again deals with the Uloth case. Certainly I will commend the minister for taking prompt action in response to my inquiries yesterday in this Legislature, but I, as well as my leader, am very much concerned that he was unaware of this situation and that in fact he appears to be, in the preamble to his announcement, defending what is indeed the indefensible: the fact that an individual responsible for the rape of a 12-year-old girl was out in the streets of the same community in which that girl resides after only two months of, as I have described it, soft time.

I would like the minister to perhaps provide the House with a more lucid explanation and a more acceptable explanation to the public at large as to why this individual, and who knows how many others across the province, are out in the streets of communities right across Ontario after serving a very minimum period of time in the provincial institutions.

Hon Mr Farnan: The temporary absence program is one of the most successful programs we have. Let me say to the member that the reality of the matter is that professional individuals—social workers, psychologists, all of these people—are involved in the assessment. In the case of this particular placement, in the agency to which he was sent there has never been a case where the individual has violated a trust at that placement. This individual he is talking about has not violated a trust at that placement, what we are saying is that we are going to be condemning an individual although he has not broken the trust of the placement. We are sensitive to the issue, we are sensitive to community concerns, and we are going to review and see if that placement is indeed appropriate with a second opinion. I believe this is fair, it is just, and I believe this is the right direction in which to go.

Mr Runciman: That is a pretty dreadful and shameful non-explanation of why that individual and many others across this province are out on the street. I want to say about breaking a trust that I was a member of Brockville city council when that halfway house was put in place, and the people of Brockville were promised that no sex offenders would be housed in that halfway facility. So the government has already breached a trust of the public.

I want to bring to the attention of the minister that I was contacted today in respect of the temporary absence program. I want to indicate that a directive was issued by this ministry, by the assistant deputy minister of operational services, to superintendents of adult institutions, 1 February 1991—so the minister cannot blame this on any previous government—ordering that all non-security screening factors for the temporary absence program were to be discontinued.

Some of those screening factors were: no temporary absence program until one sixth or one third of sentence served; temporary absences granted only after every 30 days; no temporary absences until 60 days of assessment or 60 days in the institution. All out the window because of the directive of an ADM in this ministry. One of the effects of this is that someone can be theoretically considered for a temporary absence after only six hours in a lockup. Unless there are concrete reasons not to give a TA, officials feel compelled to give it. They no longer take into account the seriousness of crime and its impact on the community.

I was advised by Ministry of Correctional Services officials that they have been keeping their fingers crossed that nobody finds out about what has happened. There has been no public consultation whatsoever. We have had a dramatic and dangerous shift in policy, and this government, which goes around telling people, "We want to consult," has not said one word to the public. They have kept it completely secret. How can the minister justify that?

Hon Mr Farnan: The member will know that in a bail program, for example, an individual can be released into the community without ever having been in an institution. The important thing is that: We have to approach this in a calm, rational, reasonable way. These are important, substantive issues. We have processes, and always at the basis of our decisions within the Ministry of Correctional Services is the safety and security both of those in our custody and of the community. We will continue to have the safety and security of all as the basis for all our judgements.

Mr Runciman: My leader made a point earlier on that this minister does not know what is going on with respect to his ministry. Perhaps it is because he has two ministries and has too much to do. I do not know. But this is a very serious issue. We are talking about public safety here, and this minister apparently did not even realize that an ADM in his ministry issued a directive in effect to shove these folks out back on to the streets. Shove them out on to the streets: It does not matter how serious their crime is, whether they are sex offenders, whether they have histories of violent crime or not. Push them back out on to the streets. Let's relieve the jail overcrowding situation and free up beds.

I do not know how this minister can stand in this House in good conscience and address this Legislature, let alone the people of Ontario, and say that is a right thing to do. Let him stand up and admit he has made a mistake and get on top of things and be concerned about public safety in this province.

Hon Mr Farnan: We will make the commitment that we will continue to work for the safety and security of all

the people of the province. We have in place decision-making processes and we have checks within that process in order that we can review decisions. That is what happened in the Uloth case and that is what we will continue to do for the future. The Ministry of Correctional Services will provide the best possible services that are available to us.

1450

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Bradley: I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. The most recent unemployment figures for Ontario reveal that the largest increase of any area in this province has taken place in the Niagara Peninsula, where the rate has soared from 7.9% in February to over 14% in the month of March, with layoffs this winter, as the minister may be aware, at Niagara Structural Steel, Tri-Sure Products, Ford Glass, Gerber Foods, Alo Canada, Nabisco, General Motors, Hayes-Dana and TRW among many others.

The minister should be aware, because he has been the mayor of a municipality, that the figures do not reveal the actual misery people are going through, the desperation, the concern, the anguish that is experienced not only by those who are unemployed but the families of those who are unemployed, and those people who remember the NDP promises of prosperity and full employment in the province.

What specific programs has the minister initiated and is he initiating to put people in the Niagara Peninsula back to work?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I have responded to that question to the Leader of the Opposition. The calamity that has befallen most of these companies our federal government induced by its fiscal policies in this nation. I will recount very briefly for members: the free trade agreement, which was enacted without the proper notification or time for companies to react to the US competition; the high interest rates, which are considerably higher, four or five percentage points higher, than those of their US counterparts; and the high Canadian dollar, which has made it very difficult for Ontario industries to compete. Also now we face the prospect of a trilateral agreement with the United States and Mexico, which again will not put us on a very level playing field, which will put even more Ontario-based industries at jeopardy.

I indicated earlier as well many of the things that this government is attempting to do to cushion the impact for those affected, and I also advise that we will be announcing further industrial strategy through the budget that the Treasurer will bring forward in a very few weeks.

Mr Bradley: The only answer I have heard so far is no answer, or I think it was answer number four in the categories produced by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, who suggested that the minister would blame the federal government for all of these. Not only are my constituents in St Catharines and people throughout the Niagara Peninsula worried about temporary layoffs, which of course limit their ability to meet their obligations, to pay their mortgages, to pay the loans they have made and to put food on the table, but they are concerned that their jobs

are going to disappear permanently; not just temporarily, permanently.

I ask the minister: What is he doing to encourage new jobs to come to the province of Ontario, to encourage people in this country and other countries to invest in new jobs in our province, and to retain those jobs which are here at the present time?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I can advise the member that we have engaged in a number of consultations with business and with labour to try to forge new partnerships to create a circumstance where we can be more productive and more competitive in this province of Ontario.

I do not wish to recount and be repetitive of the comments I made earlier, but I might cite one particular example the member might know of. We just created 250 jobs in his own riding for the Pelee Island ferry, and while he was Transportation critic he wanted those jobs to go to the United States of America.

Interjections.

Mr Bradley: People in my riding will be glad to hear that smart-assed answer.

The Speaker: The member for St Catharines, I think, knows full well what is smarting the ears of the Speaker right now and may wish to reconsider one small phrasing of his. I appreciate the intensity of feeling around the issues that are raised here, but at the same time—yes?

Mr Bradley: I certainly do not recall what it was, but anything that you consider to be offensive I would withdraw.

The Speaker: And now perhaps the member for Parry Sound, who has been waiting patiently, can place his question.

HEALTH CARE

Mr Eves: I have a question of the Minister of Health. During the past fiscal year, \$221 million of Ontario taxpayers' money has been spent by her ministry on health care in the United States of America. Do we not have adequate health facilities here in Ontario to treat these people?

Hon Ms Gigantes: As I have indicated in past answers to questions on this subject, there are areas, for example, in the treatment of people with acquired brain injury, in which we feel we do not have adequate services yet in this province, and we are undertaking the planning and the program measures that we hope will provide those services before much longer passes.

Mr Eves: That may be true with respect to that one particular aspect of health care, but the minister will also know that treatment for substance abuse is sadly lacking in the province and that many of these patients have gone to the United States for cardiovascular surgery because they cannot receive it in Ontario close enough to home or in a short period of time.

Now I understand that her ministry has hired an American-based consulting firm, Hansen Associates, to negotiate, according to an official in her ministry, "preferred financial arrangements" to expand even further her cross-border health care shopping.

The minister's party is against cross-border shopping, but it is not against cross-border health care shopping. In fact, it has hired a US firm to look into the expenditure of its money in the United States of America. To quote a Windsor doctor, "Isn't that kind of like putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop?"

Hon Ms Gigantes: The doctor in Windsor was not the one who invented that phrase. I think it was the former member for Sudbury East. The Health critic for the Conservative Party will be aware from previous statements I have made on behalf of this government that there are various measures which the government has already undertaken which we hope will help reduce the cost of the existing outflow of patients to the United States. Among those measures he will have noted, I am sure in the past, that we indicated that the Ministry of Health was hiring assistance from an insurance company—I believe it is an insurance company—in the United States familiar with the pattern of American-based insurance companies which managed to negotiate preferred rates with the American private-profit hospital system in the United States.

We see no reason why, when American private hospital corporations are seeking Canadian business, we should be paying rates above those paid by people who are insured through private companies in the United States.

Other measures which we hope will divert the flow of patients to the United States are the real core of the program needs that we have. What we are doing is developing policy which I hope to bring before this House in a very short period of time, which in fact will stop that outflow of patients and make sure we are providing services here and employing Ontarians to provide those services.

1500

PORK INDUSTRY

Mr Hansen: Tomorrow night I have a meeting with the Niagara North Pork Producers' Association. I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food regarding the continued moves by the US government against Canadian and Ontario hog and pork exports to the United States. What is the minister going to do to resist such harassment of the Ontario hog and pork industry?

Hon Mr Buchanan: I am very pleased to respond to that question. We have had considerable discussion about the free trade agreement in this House today. The pork producers put a lot of faith in the free trade agreement. They thought it would allow them to export Canadian and Ontario pork to the United States. They were faced with a countervail duty which is very significant to them. They felt it was unfair. They have been fighting it for some time with assistance from the provincial and the federal governments. About a month ago, the US International Trade Commission ruled on that countervail, said it was unfair and in fact that the duties would be returned. Since that time some of the pork producers in the United States have lobbied their government to take a second look at that, which we feel is very unfair to our producers and does not live up to the spirit of the free trade agreement.

I have written my federal counterpart, Mr Mazankowski, urging him to take very strong intervention

and make our voices heard in Ottawa. I am encouraged that Mr Crosbie is starting to speak out against this intervention. We will work with the industry to do as much as we can and encourage our federal counterparts to take very strong actions.

Mr Hansen: I understand the political pressure on the US government to maintain the duties for further review is immense. What action is the minister considering if the duties remain in place?

Hon Mr Buchanan: If the duties remain in place, we are going to have to continue to fight co-operatively with the federal government and the industry. I believe that it may be important that if Mr Crosbie and Mr Mazankowski cannot be heard in Washington, perhaps we should join with the pork producers and the processors; perhaps we should go to Washington ourselves with the producers and make our voices heard in Washington.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mrs McLeod: I found it offensive that there was only one brief sentence of support offered to northern Ontario communities and their beleaguered single-industry towns in what is now a long-forgotten throne speech. But I find it even more offensive that since that time this government has done nothing to alleviate the hardship being felt in those northern communities and has done nothing to create initiatives that would bring about new permanent jobs in northern communities.

If I can reference, in a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, the community of Atikokan, in the riding held by the Attorney General, where 515 people were laid off recently at Atikokan Forest Products and at Proboard—this is 37% of the private sector workforce in that town—I would ask the minister, what has he or his ministry or this government done specifically for the people in Atikokan to save these jobs, to create new permanent jobs to give this community some long-term stability?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I would like to refer the question to the Minister of Northern Development.

Hon Miss Martel: I appreciate the question raised by the member. It is the same kind of concern that has been raised by my colleague the Attorney General.

I would like to say to the member that we in this government have put in place a \$15-million sawmill adjustment fund that we have been trying to use in order to reactivate those communities and in particular those businesses that have been hard hit both by the 15% softwood lumber tax, high interest rates and the high value of the Canadian dollar. There are many across northern Ontario that have been hard hit.

The problem in Atikokan in particular we have been trying to address with the owner of the company. The chairman of the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corp asked what kind of assistance we could provide. We are looking at providing assistance both through the heritage fund and through the Northern Ontario Development Corp, but the problem we have now is that there is a fairly significant amount of working capital that has been requested and we are not clear at this point in time if in fact this

government can provide that working capital to that particular employer.

Mrs McLeod: I recognize the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology has referred this question now to the Minister of Northern Development, but I must say, in asking my supplementary question, that this also gives me very great cause for concern. We believed, when we formed the government, that it was the responsibility of all of the ministers of the cabinet to be concerned about northern Ontario issues, just as they would be concerned about issues across the whole of the province.

I would remind the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology that he is the minister responsible for industry in this province, in all of this province. That means he is the minister responsible for dealing with the very serious questions and concerns that face our forest products industry and our mining industry and our steel industry, and I would hope that in the future that minister would be prepared to deal with the questions related to the future of the industry and the creation of new jobs in any part of the province.

In a supplementary question to the Minister of Northern Development, I would simply ask again, what new initiatives, not necessarily in response only to those specific industries and specific jobs, although we are clearly concerned about those, but what new initiatives can she point to at this point that will have helped to create and support initiatives that would bring about new permanent jobs?

Hon Miss Martel: I am pleased to respond on behalf of the government. I would like to make the point that all of my cabinet colleagues, and indeed all of my caucus members, are very supportive of northern Ontario. I saw that even in the announcement. I might point out to the opposition that of the \$700 million that was allocated by the Treasurer in the anti-recession fund, fully 30% went to northern Ontario. I am very proud that my colleagues saw fit to do that and I am proud that we lobbied for it.

I want to raise two other points. As I have said very clearly to the member, we have put in place a \$15-million fund that is being jointly administered through MITT and my ministry to look at adjustment measures in sawmill communities and those companies that own sawmills. Second, we have provided \$15 million to the community of Elliot Lake for diversification efforts. Third, we have entered into negotiations with the Algoma Central Railway and have provided funding to ensure that it can continue so we can continue the employment in Sault Ste Marie with respect to the hospitality industry and with respect to Wawa, because those jobs in Wawa are very dependent on that train continuing to operate.

I say on behalf of the government that we are doing the best we can in northern Ontario. They are very difficult times—times, I might point out, that have not been helped by federal government policies or continued years of neglect on behalf of both the Liberals and the Tory government.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. On 25 March both the member for Leeds-Grenville and myself raised the issue in this House of the existence of X-rated porno-

graphic material which has been recently approved through a change by the Ontario Film Review Board.

At that time in this House, the minister stated the following, and I quote from Hansard:

"I do not know enough about the issue to be able to answer today. I want to be able to give a clear and concise answer." She wanted to talk to the film board "tomorrow." "It is a very important question and I take it very seriously.... I will be getting to this very soon. It is a personal priority of mine...and I will be looking into it very, very quickly."

Those were the minister's words. What has the minister done in the last three weeks about this?

Hon Ms Churley: The process for the classification of films, as the member knows, is done by the Ontario Film Review Board and there is a criminal law role for the courts and the police in enforcing the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code, which comes under federal jurisdiction.

I just want to point out that the film review board does not censor films; it classifies films. It operates under the Theatres Act and it has specific guidelines. Part of the problem right now is that the issue is before the courts and the film review board is having to make some difficult choices about what it classifies. However, they do have some guidelines right now that they are applying to what they are classifying.

We are all waiting for the results of the case that is right now before the Court of Appeal, and when that becomes apparent, when we know the answer to whatever comes out of that decision, it is going to have some impact and some influence on how the film review board classifies films. We are still waiting for that answer and in the meantime the review board is classifying according to the guidelines which it operates under.

1510

Mr Jackson: It sounds that in three weeks the minister has been able to locate a briefing book. What I was hoping was that we would take her at her word that she was going to meet with the film review board and that she was concerned, as she indicated in Hansard, about the proliferation of this kind of material.

The minister would be aware, as I know the Solicitor General is aware, that the police in Metro Toronto have confiscated off the shelves of these video stores material that has been classified by the film review board but is prohibited under the Criminal Code. This information was shared with the minister yesterday. These films involve women, with simulated sex acts with animals, bondage and violence. Yesterday, when she was advised of this by the CFTO News reporter Peter Durrant, she indicated to him that was not true. When pressed by that same reporter from CFTO News, she said, "Well, that's what my staff tell me."

We in this House who are receiving a lot of calls, the police force that is asked to press charges, the crown attorneys who have to go to court and prosecute, all have expressed concern that this province is doing nothing on this issue. So we ask the minister again, what is she doing about this issue, rather than simply waiting for the appeals

of the Judge Locke and Judge Humphrey cases, which are a year old? When is she going to do something about this filth and this material which is degrading to women in this province and which she and her government are allowing to stay out on the streets?

Hon Ms Churley: First of all, I would like to say, as I said yesterday when I was asked this question and which unfortunately was left out in that repeat of a statement I made, that I am confident and that I know and have been assured by the film review board that it does not approve films which depict the kinds of acts that have just been described by the member opposite. I have spoken to the Solicitor General about this and he is going to be looking into this. I can clarify to this House today that in fact the film review board is not classifying films that depict these kinds of acts. It is an issue that I take very seriously, as I said yesterday, and we are looking into it now.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr Owens: My question is to the Minister of Citizenship. Last week she announced the anti-racism secretariat and in yesterday's Toronto Sun columnist Christie Blatchford wrote a column on that very secretariat. Now the columnist is taking this government to task by saying we are just doing the same old thing. I would like the minister to explain to the House and to the columnist how different the anti-racism secretariat is from the race relations directorate that was set up by the previous government.

Hon Ms Ziemba: There are many differences between our anti-racism secretariat and the race relations directorate that was in place when I took over. Some of the differences are that there is going to be community involvement, there is going to be core funding for communities to start to address racism. There is also going to be a very mandatory policy to look at how racism is depicted as it is right now in various forms, whether it is in the private or public sector. We are also having an advisory council that will be advising us and guiding us, especially with the native people, to make sure that we can get rid of racism.

I was very disturbed by the article depicted in the Sun, because we see that racism does exist, and misunderstanding of racism, in this province. As my colleague stated earlier today, it is very alive and well when we see cartoons depicting the bias and the prejudice and the attitudes that exist in our society, and we must stamp it out.

Mr Owens: Further on in the column the quote is: "The assumptions behind the anti-racism strategy are huge and childishly naïve. 'Negative, intolerant attitudes towards racial groups are still widely held.'"

I would like the minister to explain to this House the kind of consultations and experiences that she undertook before (a) developing this strategy and (b) implementing it.

Hon Ms Ziemba: We did a lot of travelling around the province. We visited towns in the north, where racism against our first nations exists very strongly. We talked to various community groups in the greater Toronto area and Hamilton, and I talked to my colleagues on the opposite side who have experienced racism themselves and who told us how it is hard to overcome those biases and prejudice and

how it remains with people. We are trying to make sure we can address those problems by having an advisory council that will make sure they tell us their experiences and their problems so that we can address the issue.

Again, I must say that the Toronto Sun has completely missed the point. We are not a negative government, but what we are doing is admitting that there is a problem, as we all want to admit that there is a problem. When there is a problem we admit it and we make sure that we try to address it. I am very proud of this government because we have said, "Yes, we are against racism."

PETITIONS

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr Abel: I have a petition with 367 signatures and it reads:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows: to recommend to the Minister of Transportation the undertaking of a full review of the 403-Lynden Road extension and interchange, as previously supported and planned by the Ministry of Transportation, with a view to its implementation and construction as soon as possible, as well as commencing an Environmental Assessment Act review in the interests of the safety and convenience of the public at large."

I have another petition signed by 184 people from the riding of Wentworth North. It reads:

"We, the undersigned, are residents of the village of Linden and surrounding area. We strongly oppose the construction of an intersection at Highway 403 and the extension of Lynden Road across from the Haley farm. The dramatically increased traffic between Highway 8 and 403, especially trucks, would jeopardize the safety of our children, subject us to noise and pollution and would seriously disrupt our village way of life. For example, the one similar village of Morriston on Highway 6 is now a truck thoroughfare between 401 and 403. The village has been nearly destroyed. We object to our peaceful and friendly village coming to a similar fate due to an extremely costly and unnecessary link between two truck routes. Surely the 11-minute or 15-kilometre drive between the two planned exits will be adequate for any sensible lifestyle."

I sign my name to this petition.

ANIMALS FOR RESEARCH

Mr Malkowski: I am pleased to present a petition to the House signed by approximately 15,000 concerned citizens requesting a stop to the unnecessary and irresponsible use of animals in painful laboratory tests for cosmetic and household products. I also support this petition.

LANDFILL SITE

Mr Hayes: I am presenting a petition on behalf of the Canadian Auto Workers environment committee, together with local residents, who object to the current application by BFI to amend the Ridge Landfill Corp site certificate of approval to remove current restrictions on the service area

in Ontario served by the site and to the potential expansion of the current landfilling limits. It says:

"We, the undersigned, support the subject committee's request for an environmental assessment hearing under the Environmental Assessment Act to allow a complete and full review of all the issues regarding this matter, consistent with our government's open-door policy on waste."

It is signed by 34 residents of Kent county, and there are 300 more yet to come.

1520

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT

(EMPLOYEE WAGE PROTECTION PROGRAM), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES
NORMES D'EMPLOI

(PROGRAMME DE PROTECTION DES SALAIRES
DES EMPLOYÉS)

Mr Mackenzie moved first reading of Bill 70, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act to provide for an Employee Wage Protection Program and to make certain other amendments.

M. MacKenzie propose la première lecture du projet de loi 70, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur les normes d'emploi par création d'un Programme de protection des salaires des employés et par adoption de certaines autres modifications.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Mackenzie: This is a major new initiative that we are pleased to move today that does provide a measure of protection for workers that has not been there before in the province of Ontario, and I do hope, given the comments of members on all sides of the House, that we will have support in getting this through so that workers already entitled to their wages can collect the money that is owed to them.

The Speaker: Introduction of bills, the member for Scarborough-Agincourt.

Mr Phillips: Introduction of bills: I did not have a chance to do this properly a couple of weeks ago, but I wanted to introduce Bill Murdoch, who is the member for Grey. I do not know him well, but I think he is a fine fellow, what I do know of him. His daughter is with him today in the gallery, so I thought it was appropriate under introduction of bills to more formally introduce Bill Murdoch.

The Speaker: The member's introduction is out of order. None the less, I believe he is the only Bill in the assembly and of course now he has been properly introduced.

LAURAMAR HOLDINGS LIMITED ACT, 1991

Mr Henderson moved first reading of Bill Pr3, An Act to revive Lauramar Holdings Limited.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA
REPRÉSENTATION ÉLECTORALE

Mr Tilson moved first reading of Bill 71, An Act to amend the Representation Act, 1986.

M. Tilson propose la première lecture du projet de loi 71, Loi portant modification de la Loi de 1986 sur la représentation électorale.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Mr Tilson: The purpose of this bill is to rename the electoral district of Dufferin-Peel as the electoral district of Dufferin-Caledon.

TOWN OF OAKVILLE ACT, 1991

Mr Carr moved first reading of Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

Motion agreed to.

Mr Carr: The purpose of the bill is to enable the town of Oakville to prohibit and/or regulate the placing or dumping of fill in the town.

The Speaker: I draw to members' attention that on private bills we do not normally have any introductory remarks, but the fault was the Chair's, not the member for Oakville South.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT, 1991

Mr Silipo moved first reading of Bill Pr64, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

OPPOSITION DAY

Mr Elston: I wish to commence today just by reading this, because I know that the people who are out in the audience are not able to participate in the same way by reading the resolution and I just want to bring it to their attention in the following fashion.

I do believe that we split the time, as I understand it, so if we could have some assistance with the clock to tell us exactly where we are about to be headed, that would tell us how long each of us will be speaking.

JOB CREATION

Mr Elston moved opposition day motion 1:

That, in the opinion of this House, since the New Democratic Party has taken power, Ontario employment has fallen by 282,000 actual jobs, which is at the rate of 1,600 for every day. Ontario has fallen from its traditional position as the province with the lowest unemployment to the fourth behind Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba. Ontario has the worst job creation record of any province in Canada, based on monthly employment figures. All this government has offered for its seven months in power is a \$34-million anti-recession fund for capital projects, which amounts to about \$4.8 million per month on job creation projects, whereas the province takes in over \$120 million in revenue every day, and since this Premier and Treasurer have turned from being defenders of the people to defenders of the

status quo and have failed to provide the leadership and active government necessary for the province of Ontario in a period of severe economic recession, therefore, this House calls upon the Premier and the Treasurer to assume their leadership responsibilities in a government which has promised much, and delivered little, and undertake a comprehensive job creation program addressing all aspects of economic life in the province.

Mr Elston: It is necessary to get down to the hard facts of the situation that confronts the people of Ontario. We have some speakers who wish to follow me and my remarks will be relatively brief as we commence.

Needless to say, when we put the material together, from a statistical point of view, it was as accurate as the current statistics would have allowed us to be at the time. This motion was originally filed a week ago but unfortunately was delayed because of the missing of the time for filing the resolution with the table, and hence the extra days that have passed between the original presentation of this resolution to the table and now would mean there has been an increased accumulation of job losses in the province of Ontario and still no action.

1530

We noted yesterday with some interest and some amusement, only 24 hours before we were about to address this assembly on this extremely important and critical aspect of the New Democratic Party's failure in its role as government, that there was a recitation of events and reannouncements by the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet. Although she tried to make the best of a very thin program, she was unable to convince us or any others in the province that they actually had put their minds to any way of creating permanent employment in Ontario and actually doing something which would be of assistance to those people in communities which have been reeling under the weight of plant closures, and not just closures that are temporary in nature but the closure of plants for all time in the foreseeable future.

Those towns and villages in my part of the province and right across Ontario will never open again to provide employment for the families who have chosen to live in those communities. That is a sad comment on the material presented by the Chairman of Management Board yesterday.

In addition to that, we are interested to some degree to see today—the very day when the opposition is leading the debate on the need for the creation of permanent jobs for the province of Ontario and for instilling in the economy and in those people's minds who invest in Ontario the sense that there is reason to provide for permanent employment for permanent jobs right across the province—that the Minister of Labour stood in his place after seven or eight months of being in government and doing nothing, threw up his hands and said, "We admit that all we can do is provide a maximum of \$5,000 to those people who have not been paid the remaining amounts due to them under their contracts."

He did not say the people who were going to be helped were those people who had lost jobs, because that just is not so. People could be paid up, as is required by their

employment contracts, could be paid every penny that is owed to them and still be permanently out of a position, permanently unable to provide for their families, for their futures and for their retirements.

The program announced today in this House by the Minister of Labour, who used to rant and rave over on this side of the House all the time about how he was going to protect the people of the province, amounts to a very unhappy scam on the working people of this province. He says 12,000 people will be assisted with this, up to a maximum of \$5,000 as it is currently settled back to 1 October 1990. That may be so, but do members know what is interesting about that 12,000 number? The 12,000 employees who are going to participate in this program match almost exactly the 14,000 people who are to be employed under what is described as a \$700-million job creation program by the government of Ontario.

Is it not ironic, when you add to those 12,000 people the 1,700 people who are about to lose their jobs at de Havilland because this government has broken its promise and commitment with respect to its role, promised by the Premier of this province when he was the opposition leader and at other times, that it would look into buying de Havilland. You have an exact match between these two programs and a clear admission of failure to come to grips with the need to do the utmost these people can do to protect and salvage jobs in Ontario and create new jobs. That is their obligation.

Where are the government's failures most evident? Its failures are most evident right across the province where there are single-industry towns, like in northern Ontario, where there are small communities which have had traditional industries which no longer now make the products for which they became renowned, places like Wingham, where I grew up, where they used to make doors at Stanley door, where they used to make doors at Premdor, formerly known as Lloyd-Truax. All of those places are now closed. Harriston, where they used to make dairy products at the Canada Packers factory, is now closed. People are out of work there. The municipality is without income. I think the amount of income suggested now being lost to that community as a result of the closure of Canada Packers is some \$78,000; not an insignificant sum for a place the size of Harriston, Ontario.

What is the response? There is no response. There is a happy coincidence that these people have accelerated the placement of new roofs on schools. There is the happy coincidence that they have escalated the rate at which they are going to put some blacktop on highways. There are some good program moneys going into building new out-houses in parks, some even in my own riding. But the length of time that employment is going to exist in the riding of Bruce, Huron, Perth or Lambton or any of them is very short. There are no permanent jobs in those. There is not a creation of new jobs in those, only perhaps the preservation of some jobs that may not have been picked up as early this year if this program had not been announced, but no new permanent jobs.

There is no strategy with respect to the manner in which this government is going to create an investment

climate which makes jobs, new jobs, available to communities like those I have talked about. There has not even been a summary of a plan. There has not even been a skeleton laid out upon which we can debate the issues of the day, about whether or not there is merit in any of their proposals for the economic revitalization of Ontario.

Far from protecting Ontario, these people have stood or sat or slept through an entire depopulation of the manufacturing sector in some parts of our province that is in fact worse than at any other time in our history. These people are really laissez-faire Tories. These people are really not in the game at all. They have refused to take up the challenge that the people voted they should accept on 6 September. They have refused to do it. They will not even let us into the game in terms of understanding what their preliminary deliberations are.

We will have a budget, but do the members know what the budget is going to entail? It will have the Treasurer who sits over there smiling under the responsibilities of office. It will indicate that he will not be told by Michael Wilson what to do. That is a bit of a joke because we know that Michael Wilson had him down in Ottawa in February and he got his marching orders along with everybody else. Mr Speaker do you know what happened? Michael Wilson says 3% for the public service and—

Hon Mr Laughren: Did I follow his marching orders?

Mr Elston: No, you gave the public service more, but do you know who did get 3% transfers Mr Speaker? The community agencies got 3%.

Hon Mr Laughren: That's not true.

Mr Elston: That is what we have been told by a good number of them. The Treasurer is certainly—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The debate is not between two individuals. The debate is through me, and you address the chair, please.

Mr Elston: Mr Speaker, the debate may not be between individuals, but through you to the individual who is debating, back through you to me, I can tell you he is not doing very much to create the climate in which Ontario will have successful investment. There are so many things that could be done, but I do not want to take up too much more of the time now except to reserve a couple of minutes at the very end for my wrapup so that my colleagues can tell the people in this province what these people have not done, what they could do and what they should do.

We have seen no action and we want a commitment today from the Treasurer with respect to the critical need to develop this plan. The Premier does not see that this is important enough, neither does the Minister of Northern Development and neither does the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. We want a commitment from the Treasurer, who is really the person in charge now because the next three-week lead-up is critical to his budget and he can tell us he is going to have a job creation program, a job investment strategy which will allow us to have permanent jobs in place in this province.

1540

Mr Carr: I am pleased to rise to speak on this occasion on a very important motion regarding the economy.

As we start off, I guess I am a little concerned that it comes from a party that has made us the most heavily taxed jurisdiction in all of North America. In fact, their actions have made us the worst-taxed in all of North America. I am a little upset when we have a government, the previous government, that has been able to double and triple spending at a time when individuals and groups like families and so on have had to balance their budgets.

As we sit here and I look at the NDP government with all its self-serving sensitivity, trying to see if it is really responding to the human realities that touch people where they live and work, quite frankly, I see that it is not. We have a program that comes in—announced today, as a matter of fact—where they say we are going to have something to help the laid-off workers. Really what they are doing is taking a look at the symptoms instead of trying to find a cure. Instead of saying, "We're going to try to make sure those people don't have jobs," they say, "We know we're going to lose them and we know they're going to go out, so we'll try to help them." We need to be able to say, "How are we going to stop those people from losing their jobs?" I would have hoped the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology would have come up with an announcement very soon to do that.

One of the things we have to realize, in this day and age in the world of international markets, is that if we are not competitive we are going to lose markets. When companies and businesses lose markets, guess what happens? People lose jobs. Nothing has been laid out that is going to end that cycle of making us uncompetitive. I was thinking even a broken clock is right twice a day, and yet we have seen nothing from this government in any way to make us more competitive.

The Globe and Mail article that was published on Wednesday talks about the job losses in the province and compares this recession to the last recession. It is interesting to note that British Columbia and Alberta actually had an increase in the number of jobs. Guess what, I ask members on the other side? They have the same federal government we do. The federal government is the same one for Alberta and British Columbia. Do members remember that?

It is interesting to note that in 1981 and 1982, when the Conservative government was in place, Ontario was the best of all the provinces in terms of jobs lost. It is interesting to see, when you compare it with the recession in 1981 and 1982, that Ontario did a pretty good job versus the rest of the provinces. Unfortunately, today we are not doing a very good job. I suspect some may call it luck that it was a Conservative government at that time. I tell the members, people look at the results and during that period of time we fared much better.

As the Treasurer knows, as we sit here we spend about \$12 million a day just to pay the interest on our debt in this province. That is not to pay back the principal; that is \$12 million a day just to pay the principal loan. Unfortunately,

it is going to be my children and probably even my grandchildren who are going to have to pay off this debt.

The Treasurer said that deficits do not scare him. They might not scare him, but statements like that scare me because deficits are nothing but deferred taxes. What we need is to get rid of the simplistic challenges of single issues and have long-term planning.

I reflect on a report here that talks about competitiveness in Canada. It talks about some of the competitive measures that need to be taking place in this particular day and age. It talks about labour skills. We need to increase the amount of labour skills. I say to the Minister of Labour, let's look into doing something in that area so that we improve. It talks about the tax structures. I say to the Treasurer, who is preparing the tax position with the next budget coming up, that we do not need any new taxes. This is being confirmed by companies around the rest of the world. He is giving me the signal, "Maybe, maybe not," so hopefully we will be able to convince him. It also talks about the regulations. It talks about the fact that our industries in this province are the most highly regulated. It talks about new technology. As I sit here and reflect on all the things that the experts say we need to do, what are we doing? Are we moving in any of these areas? Are we moving in the area of labour skills? No. Are we moving in the area of making sure taxes do not rise? Maybe we are, maybe we are not. We will see in the budget. I hope we do. Are we moving in any way to decrease the amount of regulations? No. Anything on technology? No, nothing in that area. We are setting up a fund to help the laid-off workers but we are doing nothing to make sure those workers keep their jobs. We have no long-term plans in place.

I say to the government across that it is not how much it spends, it is how it spends. As we sit here, we need to get rid of the self-styled sensitivity and start getting some action, because that is how the government is going to be judged. It is not going to be judged on its promises. It is not going to be judged on how much it spends because, quite frankly, all the opponent I beat in the election kept saying was, "We spent more on health care." Yes, but we got waiting lists. "We spent more on the environment." But the environment was worse under them. All he did was talk about the amount of money that was spent, but people want results.

When we look at the figures, the results that are here are very, very clear. At a time when the province in the last recession was managed properly, guess what? We fared better than any other province in this country. In fact, when we look at the statistics, it is even dramatic. As we sit here today, we see that Quebec, which in terms of size is almost equivalent to our economy, has only lost 2.6% of the jobs. Ontario's rate has been double that. So we are faring worse than all the other people.

Why is there all this blaming of other governments and assigning the blame and saying: "It's not our fault. We got elected, but it's not our fault. Blame those other guys." As I said before, if the members opposite really thought it was a federal issue, why did they not run federally when they had the chance? Why did they not run federally if it is so

important? If members come to this House and they are provincial politicians, guess what? They worry about provincial issues. If members want to run federally—and I am sure the federal leader next time around might want to have some of the members run—but if it is really that important then get up to Ottawa and fix it up there. Do not blame them. Get up there and do something. That is what happens with municipalities and that is what should happen with provincial governments. We have to end this mindless finger-pointing, although the former Treasurer came in; maybe we can start finger-pointing a little bit towards him. No, I will not.

As we sit here today, we have absolutely nothing in place to be able to make jobs in this province. If, as has been the case, blaming other governments would be helpful, then the jobs would come back very quickly because we are very good at that. But when it comes to real action, I say to the members opposite who are here that we have to be results oriented, not activity driven. We have to have results because, quite frankly, that is what they are going to be judged on. They are not going to be judged on saying, "We spent more on this program," \$50 million or \$20 million, because people are not going to realize that. They are going to take a look and say, "Where were we when your government took over and where are we now?" That is going to be the criterion.

The judgement is going to be the number of jobs. It is going to be the deficit. The line has already been drawn in the sand. That is where the deficit was, where we left it. Now it is going to be taken from there. The tax structure is already in place and that is what people are going to judge the government by. It has four years to do it, maybe four and a little bit, whatever the amount of time is. That is what it is going to be judged on.

As we sit here today, some of the members are saying, "What would you like to see?" Unfortunately, these people were elected with a lot of plans about what they would like to do and yet, when they come in, absolutely nothing has happened.

Now, like most people, we figure: "We'll give them a little bit of time. They have to find their way around, but eventually they are going to be able to get in there and find out how it works and how it operates." Now what has happened is all the people are saying, "We can't do anything for the budget."

The Treasurer has pushed it off and said: "Wait for the budget. Wait for the budget. Wait for the budget." The budget gets put back, and I know it has been a long process putting that together. Quite often I meet the Treasurer late at night on the streets going home, so I know he is working hard on it. But starting on that date, that is going to be when people mark what needs to be done. That is the time when people are going to say, "Okay, up until then, you have had your chance." Now when the budget comes, guess what? The ball is in the government's court.

1550

As we sit here now my big fear is that it is going to take four years for the members opposite even to figure out what needs to be done, let alone come up with solutions. As we sit here, we have seen absolutely nothing. I

think people wanted to be fairly complimentary to the government to start off, but unfortunately nothing has been done, nothing has been done. As we sit here, nothing has been done.

This opposition motion talks about job creation and what we are going to do. Unfortunately, over the last little while we have seen absolutely nothing but the same old rehash of, "We spent \$700 million and that is how we are doing it." But unfortunately we keep going farther and farther back. So do not start talking about how much we spend, because people do not really, quite frankly, care. They want to see the results. The results are what we have got to be after. At the end of the day if we can see the results, we will be pleased. In fact, I will be the first person to stand up and congratulate the government on it.

But we have a Treasurer who says during this period of time the exact opposite of what needs to be done. He has not ruled out tax increases, and he is going to probably run up the deficit to how high we go—the exact opposite of what needs to be done. At a time when the individuals have to cut back in their spending and watch every dime and every penny and every quarter, we have a government that continues to spend, and there are no controls in place. The other day the Treasurer was asked what controls were in place. There are no controls in place.

Municipal governments are going through the budget process and trying to cut and look for ways to restructure things, but when it comes to provincial government it is inflation plus, inflation plus, inflation plus: "Continue on; we'll find the money somewhere." Well, I think the members opposite have found the cupboard is bare. There is no more money left. There were some members opposite who when they came in here thought the money would drop out of the ceiling. I honestly, truly believe there were some members who thought the money was going to fall out of the ceiling.

I do not particularly think the Premier or the Treasurer thought that, because they had been around a long period of time; the Treasurer some 20-odd years, I believe, and the Premier—who is a bright guy, a Rhodes scholar—I do not think he thought it was going to fall out of the ceiling. But some members, I think, honestly, truly did feel the money was going to be there. Well, guess what? It is not here any more. They have come home to the reality. They were driven by their ideology. Now they are confronted with the reality that there is no money left.

As we sit here, I encourage and I hope that we are going to have some action, some results that are going to take place rather than a lot of rhetoric.

My background before I came to this fine House was one of a business person, and one of the things that has been so upsetting to me is the fact that we do not get anything done here. We have eloquent speeches, and believe me, everybody is great at that. We are great at talking, but we never move forward. Of all things, that has been the most discouraging part that I have faced here: the fact that we sit here, we debate it, we talk about it, but nothing seems to get done. I think what we need to do is to start to move a little bit quicker in a lot of these areas.

For those members opposite and the Treasurer, I would get him to take a look at some of these statistics that are in a book like this by some of the brightest and most brilliant minds around on what to do to make us competitive. In fact, the accounting firm that produced this—and I will not publicize them—actually says you can have briefings and you can have as many copies as you would like to have. The Treasurer is asking for one. He definitely can have it.

In here it outlines some of the things that need to be done. It also tells what some of the rest of the world has done. It talks about what the Japanese have done, what the West Germans have done, and I hope we will take some of those actions as well.

So those were some of my thoughts on the issue, and I would like to at this time wind up my remarks by saying that people are out there expecting action. We need some action, not rhetoric.

Mr Christopherson: I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this important resolution. I think it needs to be said from this side of the House that it is an important issue for us to be talking about. In fact, from the day this government took office, our Premier and our ministers have been saying that the number one issue for us is the economy. I think that it is important to send out the message, not only from this government but from the opposition benches, that indeed all of us accept and respect the fact that the economy is indeed the number one issue. I am pleased that that is the matter for today's debate and I appreciate the opportunity to join in that debate.

I have some difficulty with some of the positions put forward by members of the opposition, not the least of which is that continuously the opposition party, the official opposition, wants to have it both ways on the issue of the economy and the forecasting of the economy and who knew and who should have known what and when. Our Treasurer has clearly said that we do not believe there was any wrongdoing on the part of the previous government vis-à-vis bookkeeping or presentations of information, because it is not reasonable, once we got into office and looked, for anyone to expect that a government could have seen at that time the depth, the breadth of the recession and just how devastating it would be. None of the indicators were pointing to that. Our Treasurer has indicated that. Members of the opposition have acknowledged and quoted those remarks in their own defence, and I offer that up again as being the position of our government, that we do not think there is wrongdoing there.

However, what becomes difficult to accept is that having accepted that position, the official opposition then thinks we should have to be answerable for the fact that we did not know in the middle of the election in the summer, at the same time frame we are now talking about, that we were heading into that same kind of recession and the same kind of depth. That, I think, from a fairminded point of view, shows a clear inconsistency on the part of the opposition. I think they would like to have it both ways. I do not think that is fair and I do not think the public accepts that having that both ways is the correct way to view that particular issue.

Another member of the opposition talked about our whole approach being a scam. I think that was the word that was used. I would just like to say for the record that what I think is a scam is the fact that the previous government feels it has legitimate grounds to criticize what it says has not been done by this government and what we have done since we have taken office. I say that based on the fact that a review of recent history points to a very different story.

If go back to 1985, and I believe I have my years correct, when there was the change of government under the accord, that was probably the most successful period of time for that government. Being parochial in this statement, I would suggest that was because it had a game plan and a blueprint that represented the needs of Ontario and it had the measures necessary to put in place legislation that would correct that. It was that accord, it was the NDP agenda at that time, that gave the Liberal Party the kind of votes in the next election that gave it a majority government, in fact the largest majority in the history of this province. Then, when it was on its own and did not have the benefit of NDP thinking and an NDP agenda, when it had to drive it itself, at the end of the day when the people passed judgement, look what happened.

I feel very confident saying that at the end of the day, not in another day or two or a week, but at the end of the day of this term in office, after at least four budgets by the Treasurer, not just one but four, and once we have had a chance to do the things that we have said we will do and the things that we will do, I am convinced that when the public reviews that agenda, we will indeed be back here again. I honestly believe that and I think history has shown that is about to happen.

1600

Interjections.

Mr Christopherson: I know that members of the opposition are expressing that they are tired of hearing about what we have done, but I guess when members opposite are being beaten down with success, it is not surprising they do not want to hear about it.

The fact of the matter is, regardless of how much noise we may hear from the opposition benches, the anti-recession program in this province has been effective, it will be effective and it will do the job that we wanted it to do, because we did not just throw money at the recession. There was a lot of thought and a lot of care taken. These measures, the money that is being spent is being spent on the infrastructure of our municipalities and of our province and that is an investment in the future of this province, not just money being thrown at a problem without a good return.

Next, very much care was taken to be sure that we were not spending the money after we began to come out of the recession, because that would not be smart economics. The money needed to be spent within a time frame of the recession so that it was helping the province, helping cushion the effect of the recession and putting in place those measures that would allow us a strong recovery from the recession. I believe the care that was taken to put together that program will show itself to be of great benefit

to the province as time unfolds, and I am prepared to stand behind those remarks, as I know my good friend the member for Etobicoke West, when he reads Hansard, will remind me, should that not be the case.

There has also been reference to what happened in 1981 and in 1982 and how different it was and how terrible things are now. The reality is, and it needs to be said, that the difficulties we are experiencing now are not the result of a change in government in a recent election. I would suggest to members that the depths of this recession would be at least what they are—and if I were parochial I would say worse, but I will not—at least what they are if it had been the previous government that stayed in office. Why? The reason is that we have a different kind of recession.

We have different things happening in the economy and fairminded, objective individuals in the province have said publicly, in front of our committee during the pre-budget consultations, that, to repeat myself, no one was expecting the recession to hit the way it is, but people are acknowledging that Ontario was hit sooner and harder than any other province in this country and that is unlike anything we saw in the early 1980s. That is not even to talk about the details of the restructuring, which again will show us a very slow climb out of this recession without the kind of automatic job return that we saw in the early 1980s.

The response we have to take cannot be just a knee-jerk reaction for a short political gain; it has to be a measured response that puts in place the pieces that will allow us to re-establish as a strong economy. I believe we will do that through things like the anti-recession program but also through a number of other measures, many of which will come out in the budget and others which will flow from budgetary measures.

I am talking about things such as a recognition of the need for a competitive and strong economy, a recognition that a strong economy is tied to our skills development, to an investment in our universities as well as a new relationship with municipalities and other funding partners. I am falling back now on my previous experience as a municipal councillor when I say that in many ways quality of life issues are decided at the municipal level. All of those things are going to come together during the term of this government to build a stronger Ontario and to address the very pressing needs that we have right now.

I would like to close my comments by again acknowledging the fact that while it is not the position of this government to say all of the Ontario woes are the fault of the federal government, it needs to be said as often from this side as it has from the other side that those measures have had a significant, serious, damaging effect on the economy of this province. As long as we have a federal government that works at odds against this provincial government, it makes our job that much more difficult, and if it takes a change of government federally to do the trick, then maybe that is what ought to happen. But that is not helping us. We need a partner federally, not somebody who is hurting our activities and our measures.

Mrs Fawcett: I very much want to put some remarks on the record concerning this important topic. Earlier this

week, when I rose in the House to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology a question about the plant closure of Cooper Tools in my riding in the town of Port Hope, he did not give a very good answer. Cooper Tools had just celebrated 100 years of manufacturing in the town and it had been home to three generations of employees. I asked this question, hoping that I would see indication from this government that it realizes action is required to help these victims of yet another plant leaving this province.

But instead of action, I received the same type of rhetoric this government has used for the past seven months. The minister totally avoided the question and tried to provide solace to these families by saying he was building an industrial plant in Cobourg and somehow this anti-recessional industrial plant would create jobs, perhaps the jobs they were losing.

I say it is fine to put up a building and call it an industrial plant, but what industry is going to move in? Is there an announcement forthcoming? This government has done nothing to encourage any type of industrial expansion. In fact, since this socialist government has taken office, we have seen nothing but an exodus of industry from this province. We have seen the number of people unemployed increase by over 180,000. We have lost more than 110,000 manufacturing jobs and I say "lost" because they have looked at the socialist government and decided to relocate elsewhere, never to come back again.

Like Cooper Tools in Port Hope, the doors on these factories are being locked and will not be reopened because not only have they left the province, but they have left the country. I remind the members opposite of their Agenda for People. Do they remember their promise to establish a jobs protection board that would determine whether plant closures are justified? Where is this protection board? How many of these plants like Cooper Tools have they determined are justified in closing their doors? What does the government say to the people of Ontario who are suddenly put on UI and ultimately on to the welfare rolls? I can tell the government that welfare rolls have doubled in Northumberland and are on the increase.

I suggest to the government that its almighty anti-recession package has not opened one door. While in government, we put in place the eastern Ontario community economic development program. Many communities—from Cornwall to Cobourg, from Ottawa to the Otonabee River—have made use of this program to enhance their industrial parks, to develop their economic strategy and to encourage industry. Coupled with the eastern Ontario cabinet committee, we were successful in addressing the needs of this most vital part of the province.

I ask the member for Kingston and The Islands and the member for Frontenac-Addington, whom I see present in the House, and the member for Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings—I think he was here but perhaps he has gone now—where is the cabinet committee for eastern Ontario? What are their colleagues the member for Hastings-Peterborough and the member for Ottawa Centre doing to put the issues of eastern Ontario on the cabinet table?

1610

The town of Port Hope has just passed a resolution for the enrichment, enhancement and extension of the eastern Ontario community economic development program so as to adequately address the needs for economic and sustainable development in eastern Ontario. What will this government's response be to that? I hope not just another patchwork package of policies and programs that do little to meet the very real needs of eastern Ontario.

Mr Ruprecht: They are still consulting.

Mrs Fawcett: Probably they are.

Another large segment of my riding that is suffering greatly from these very tough economic times is the agricultural community, and I am sure, Mr Speaker, this is of interest to you. It is one thing to be frustrated, but it is another thing to be completely demoralized. The farmers that I speak to tell me that they just cannot take any more. They only ask that they see a fair return for the countless hours they spend trying to make agriculture a viable industry.

Keeping in mind that agriculture is directly or indirectly responsible for one out of five Ontario jobs, we have to ensure that our farmers can compete with our neighbours to the south as well as European markets. No other industry is at the mercy of the elements of Mother Nature like agriculture is.

Farmers need to feel secure that existing stabilization formulas truly reflect the economies of the day. They cannot tolerate the yo-yo syndrome any longer. Cabinet should reconsider its decision not to fund the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement, MISA, which was a major disappointment to the farm community. This program was the last hope for many commodities such as horticultural crops. The government's decision to ignore this part of the agricultural industry will have a significant negative effect on many farmers and related industries and businesses across Ontario and particularly in my riding.

Where is this government's vision for the farm community? Where are the long-term plans to put agriculture on a basis with some lasting financial stability? This government seems to think it can ignore its election promise of \$100 million to support long-term lending and ask retired farmers to invest their savings instead.

As the numbers of farmers decline and the agriculture economy faces its lowest level of net income in five years, rural communities need to diversify their economies and farmers are looking for additional or alternative sources of income. Because they are seen to be looking in vain for this help, a number of communities in rural Ontario are facing stagnant or negative growth.

I remind the member for Hastings-Peterborough of something that one of the finest federal agricultural ministers this country has seen, my good friend Eugene Whalen, said: "When the land lies fallow, all other forms of life suffer." This is something we could all contemplate seriously.

Today is not very encouraging for the people of Ontario, who had such high hopes last September. They have looked in vain for the fulfilment of the promises they voted for, but instead they are stuck with empty pockets, empty cupboards, empty talk, meaningless promises. The

people of Ontario deserve better than this. Answers like, "It is under review. We are doing the best we can. We are consulting on that," just do not slice it.

I implore the Premier to do something. I tell this government, "Your brothers and sisters are watching you." They are waiting for action as their factories come crumbling down around them. They are hoping the rug will not be pulled out from underneath them the same way it was pulled from the skilled tradespeople at Ontario Hydro. Just ask them, or perhaps let the member for Peterborough tell what happened to them in Peterborough. The Premier has not only let his family in this House down; he has failed to help those who put him there, and as they wait for action, so do all of the people of Ontario.

I close now and again implore this government on behalf of my constituents in Northumberland and the people of Ontario to do something before it is too late.

Mr J. Wilson: I am very pleased to rise and join the debate on the resolution put forward by the member for Bruce. I find it ironic that the Liberals have the audacity to introduce such a motion when they spent our province into oblivion and we became the highest-taxed jurisdiction in North America. Members have heard me speak very, very often about the town of Collingwood in my riding, where almost a third of its workforce—2,000 out of a total population of only 12,000—are now unemployed, not as a result of the free trade agreement—and I hope the NDP members are listening across the way—but as a result of the very high taxation levels in this province. It disturbed me greatly during the campaign when my local NDP candidate kept running around using the member for York South's phrases that we have to tax the rich and tax corporations. I tried to explain to him at many all-candidates meetings that you cannot simply continue to tax corporations, because if they do not make a profit they cannot pay taxes. It is a fundamental economic principle that we are having a very difficult time in the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party on this side of the House explaining to the members opposite.

The member for Hamilton Centre—let's do a little bit of history here—said that during the campaign back in September they were unaware of the recession. I would say that is bogus. You had to have had your head stuck in the sand not to know that the wild spending spree of the previous Liberal government would not lead us into hard times at this point in history. It seems to me that if the NDP in its Agenda for People, which I affectionately call the agenda for power, where it outlined a number of initiatives it was going to take—in fact, my NDP candidate spent a great deal of time in the campaign promising the workers of Collingwood that indeed he would protect their jobs. The layoffs in Collingwood have occurred at Harding Carpets, Kaufman furniture, Goodyear hose plant, LOF Glass, Reynolds-Lemmerz and Bendix Safety Restraints, which packed up and went to Mexico.

So it is 2,000 jobs, and there is a quote here from the local newspaper. They quoted Mr Losereit, who was the NDP candidate, some of the phrases he used during the election campaign, and I will read the quote from the Collingwood Enterprise-Bulletin, which says: "It was Mr

Losereit who said his colleagues, now making up the governing party in this province, would bring in tough plant-closing legislation, improve training and retraining opportunities and mobilize huge amounts of investment capital in Ontario to build our economy. With all the layoffs, layoffs at Bendix"—and he goes on to list the number of layoffs—"The David Peterson government has failed to lift a finger to help," said the NDP candidate during his campaign."

But reading further from the same editorial: "By putting its pre-election words into action, the NDP government must end its silence in one of the hardest-hit areas of the province. Public demonstrations by labour heighten public awareness but limit their scope considerably by strictly slamming the Conservatives. We ought to look at what is going on in our provincial capital where the politicians in power are conspicuous by their silence."

We have heard from this government that it has introduced a \$700-million anti-recession program. We have heard that that will create some 20,000 jobs, but we have also had the Minister of Transportation admit, and I appreciate his honesty, that in many instances those will not be new jobs.

My own father is unemployed in Alliston and has been for quite some time, and he has no hope of finding a job because this government continues on the trend of the previous Liberal government to spend us into oblivion. They put out the false hope, which I say is a moral sin that the Premier and the New Democratic Party committed during the election campaign, the false hope to the poor and the unemployed that they would protect their jobs, raise their levels of income, and somehow this money, as my colleague said earlier, would fall from the ceiling.

1620

The false hope is premised on the assumption that politicians create jobs. I have not met a politician alive today or one in the past who has ever created one job. We do not and we should not tell the people of this province and the people of my riding that we create jobs. If you took a lesson in economics, you would know that our responsibility here is to create the economic climate so that businesses will once again want to invest in Ontario, and we have to stop the haemorrhaging of businesses leaving not only Collingwood but many other areas of Ontario.

The government has not taken one initiative to do that. In fact, its initiatives, I would suggest, do exactly the opposite. It paints us into a corner politically, and I will discuss that in a minute. We are losing 1,600 jobs a day, and the government has done nothing to address the tax structure in this province. It introduces things like pay equity—or it is going to introduce some of these things—extended parental leave, an environmental bill of rights, the wage protection fund—the announcement the minister made today—raising the minimum wage, and creating a new French-language school board in the county of Simcoe, which local people consider a tremendous waste of money because the need simply is not there. The government does these things which politically do not cost it much money, but they are costing jobs.

We have not seen the studies from this government on what these wonderful programs, if we could afford them, are going to cost us in terms of jobs. It is difficult for us to argue that these programs will cost jobs when the government does not provide us with information and data and studies as to what effects these programs will have.

They are motherhood issues. The Premier, in many people's estimation in the province, in many people's eyes, has a corner on compassion. But I want to re-emphasize the words of my colleague the member for Oakville South, who made it very clear that under the Conservative government, some six years ago now, we had good management in this province. We did not have these problems that are very much out of control across the board. We took a commonsense approach to government. We kept taxes in line. We enjoyed a 9.6% tax advantage over Quebec. That has been wiped out right now.

The opposition talks about the free trade agreement, and I want to read a couple of quotes about the free trade agreement, because I do not think we should skirt the issue in this House. Those guys throw it back at us every single day. If we read the Western Report of 4 March 1991—and it is a lengthy quote, but I think it is well worth reading—it says:

"Canada's manufactured exports to the US jumped by \$4 billion during the first 21 months of the free trade agreement, the Canada West Foundation reported last week. Exports of Canadian raw materials and primary products declined. Overall, Canadian sales to American buyers rose about 7% after inflation is removed from the figure. Against that improved export performance, imports from the US remained static. These positive results directly contradict warnings shouted loud and long by self-styled nationalists before the free trade agreement was implemented on January 1, 1989."

There is also one from the Canada West Foundation in February which says:

"Plant closings and job layoffs tend to be highlighted in the Canadian media, while news of plant expansion and new jobs is usually not headline news. The Canadian Labour Congress recently suggested that 225,000 jobs had disappeared because of the free trade agreement. This is a clear misrepresentation. First, job losses in auto companies, airlines, fishing, breweries, trucking, railways, are being mistakenly and irresponsibly blamed on a trade policy which left these sectors exempt or untouched. These same sectors have also undergone substantial job losses in the US for the same reason as in Canada: sluggish demand."

It is a complete falsehood to keep blaming the federal government for the NDP's problems. They are the government now. We expect them to take some action. We expect them to put people back to work. The greatest dignity you can give an individual is a job, and that has to be the underlying premise.

Second, we have to regain our economic competitiveness. We met as a caucus with the poverty coalition that was here a couple of days ago. After some explanation to them, they too realized that the greatest dignity we could provide is a job, the opportunity for employment and the economic climate for new jobs and increased productivity

in this province. We explained to them that the money does not come out of the ceiling; that companies have to make a profit, which is a dirty word for the NDP. They have to make a profit if they are going to keep investing in Ontario, if their plants are going to remain open in Ontario and if they are going to keep our constituents employed.

The Treasurer has made it clear that he is not really opposed to large deficits, but one would have thought that with the 16 years of socialism under Pierre Trudeau and the disastrous effects that had on this nation, those guys would have learned something over there, that they would have learned from straight economic fact that the \$200-billion deficit that the federal government inherited in 1984 from the Liberal regime has now gone up to almost \$400 billion; 80% of that is strictly interest on the original \$200 billion, totally out of the control of the current federal government.

I am pleased that the Treasurer is here today. Surely he has learned from that socialism period we had under the Trudeau regime that he cannot introduce programs without a plan to pay for them. He cannot put new burdens on industry without expecting job losses.

We would expect to see from this government an economic strategy for Ontario. It has the Minister Industry, Trade and Technology who we know takes naps in the afternoon when he really should be sitting down, sharpening his pencil, meeting with industry with meaningful consultations, and we know that is not true, because we have also talked to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which feels it is being used as a scapegoat by his government. They should be sitting down as a cabinet and creating an economic strategy, not a program that supposedly creates jobs in the form of an anti-recession program but, as we have heard argued, they are not new jobs. I would have personally—I cannot speak for all of my colleagues on this one—preferred that the government had taken that \$700 million and applied it to trying to get us back into a more competitive position with other provinces and other jurisdictions in North America.

You do not hear other provinces, like Quebec and the west, complaining about the free trade agreement, because they knew there were opportunities there, and immediately after the agreement came in Quebec did tax reform and readjusted its competitive position, an absolute fact of history.

The Liberal government at that time, David Peterson played politics with the people of my riding and with their jobs. He sat around and said, "Bad agreement, bad federal government, the worst thing that could happen to this country," and it is almost as if he wanted a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is almost as if he called that election early so he could go to the people and say: "Well, we're heading into a recession. Things don't look so great." Although he claimed to have a surplus, we knew—I said very clearly, by reading the economic documents provided by the government itself—that it was probably close to a \$1-billion deficit. It was pretty easy to see pre-cash flows and pre-payments in a document. But he ran around, pretended everything was great when he failed to address an agreement that was signed and agreed to by most provinces and he failed to do anything about it.

The government's challenge is not to blame the federal government, not to shirk its responsibility. Its challenge is to start putting down an economic strategy that we would be happy to help it formulate, discussing with business in a meaningful way how we can become more competitive and to create jobs, not directly by giving out handouts, but by creating the economic climate so that businesses will once again want to produce in Ontario.

I am also disturbed that Diane Francis wrote in the *Financial Post* yesterday that an individual in Ontario could earn up to \$45,000—

Mr Johnson: She's wrong.

Mr J. Wilson: Well, she makes a very good argument, because of the tax-free benefits under welfare and prescription drugs and dental, all great things, but the government has increased welfare payments by some 17%, but where is the money going to come from? It is a great thing during good times to put money into programs that help the poor and they certainly need help. In my own family, I have individuals who definitely need help, but it is absolutely astounding that an individual in Ontario is better off not working. The message that this article in yesterday's *Financial Post* sends out to the people of Ontario is that if you make under \$45,000 a year you might as well quit work, you might as well just sit on your duff because the government is going to look after you. That is the wrong message to be sending out to the people of Ontario.

1630

One of the first things this government did was increase welfare payments; as I said, a great thing, except how are we going to pay for it? You cannot jack up the deficit any more because, as the member for Oakville South correctly pointed out, deficit is simply deferred taxes. Do members opposite want to know what they are supposed to do? They should sit down with us. We would be happy to help them get out of their socialist ideology. They are stuck in their ideology. The government knows how to distribute wealth but it does not have a clue how to create it. It does not have a clue what an economic strategy is and it has not written a business plan for a business.

We have a lot of talent in our caucus. We would be happy to help the government in that line before this province continues to slide down the spiral we have been on. They should take a lesson from the 16 years of Trudeau where there were all kinds of wonderful programs that he kept getting re-elected on, all kinds of wonderful programs introduced, but there was no concept and the actuaries at the time were actually telling us, "These programs are going to run out of money, folks," that the Canada pension plan in the year 2000 will be out of money. But Trudeau and his style of socialism said: "Don't worry about that. We're going to introduce the program anyway." Now the bills are in.

My worry is that the government is taking Ontario down the same path, that it has not learned from history. If spending in a recession was the answer, then why is this recession centred in Ontario? Those guys spent absolutely wildly, the Liberals. My constituents asked me, and they are asking me still today, "Where did all the money go that

the Liberals brought in?" As the member for Oakville South pointed out, we have never had longer hospital line-ups, we have never had poorer service in our field of education—at least there is a great deal of dissatisfaction—and at the same time we have never had higher taxes at all levels of government. Where did the money go?

This government's challenge is to create an economic strategy for this province. We would be happy to help them. My constituents know that is the need. I hope the government will take the time to address that rather than spend us into oblivion and repeat the mistakes of the past.

Hon Mr Cooke: I just want to take a few minutes to participate in this debate. I must say, just to comment very briefly to the previous speaker in this debate, that it is wishful thinking to think that we are not going to talk about the impact that the federal government policies have had on this province and on the people of this province. It would be rather simplistic to think that we are not going to talk about free trade, the level of the dollar and interest rates, because they directly impact on the competitiveness of the manufacturing sector of this province. Those factors, more than anything else, have devastated this province.

The Conservatives obviously are going to try not to talk about those matters, but when we are developing our tax strategy and our economic strategy we have to take into consideration the terrible economic consequences of the federal government policies. This is a very difficult time. If the member wants to come to see where the federal government's economic policies have had the most negative effect, he should come down to my community: 16% unemployment, substantial layoffs and many plant closures.

The member was trying to indicate a few moments ago that the auto sector has not been impacted at all by the free trade agreement. He does not understand the free trade agreement. He knows as well as I do, or he should know, that the free trade agreement eliminated the safeguards in the auto pact. The auto pact, which was established in the mid-1960s, had some very substantial safeguards for jobs and production here in Ontario. Those safeguards were absolutely eliminated. In fact, the most important was that we moved away from 60% Canadian content to 50% North American content. Anyone who understands the auto sector at all knows that 50% North American content has built right into it an incentive to move manufacturing sectors of the auto industry into Mexico.

What we have seen dramatically in our community is that the low-tech manufacturing aspect of auto has moved to Mexico and the high-tech is staying in the United States, so that we are being absolutely devastated in our community. No one in my riding is confused, as obviously the Conservative caucus is. Everyone in my riding understands very clearly that free trade, high interest rates and a high dollar—and the high dollar was part of the free trade deal that was struck by the Mulroney government—have had the devastating impact they have had on my community.

When the people in the Windsor area have gone to the federal government and said: "Help us out. We would like to revitalize our community," Mulroney and his cabinet's response has been, "You did not vote for the Conservative

Party, so we ignore the community of Windsor." That is exactly what has happened: We have gotten zip from the federal government, so our government has responded, very substantially.

I hear from the Liberal caucus members, and it is obviously a case of feeling very difficult about the election, how bitter they are that they talk about our doing nothing in the 26 weeks that we have been in government. Let's look at some of the things that we have done.

The \$700-million capital fund has been talked about, has been reported, is real. In my community, it means over \$20 million of job creation in the Windsor and Essex area. In addition, to stimulate the economy the Treasurer made a commitment that the retail sales tax would not be on top of the GST, \$500 million dollars of savings for the people of this province.

In my own ministry we have thousands of additional housing units, by reallocating the Homes Now program and making sure that instead of the 14,000 or 15,000 units that were going to be built under the Homes Now program, all 30,000 are going to be delivered to the people of this province—thousands of jobs.

Mr Nixon: That was our commitment. What about your 20,000? What about your commitment for 20,000?

Hon Mr Cooke: The previous government's commitment was 30,000 and it was not happening, and the former Treasurer knows that.

There was a 7% increase in welfare. Sure, the previous government had announced 5% of that, but we increased it by 2% and we doubled the increase in the shelter allowance, a very substantial move by the government in the first 25 weeks of government. The employee wage protection program was announced today by my colleague the Minister of Labour. There is the initiative in my ministry on rent control to offer protection to tenants in this province. There is the family and child custody support legislation. When that bill is passed, potentially over \$300 million will go to women and children in this province. There has been aid to farmers, \$50 million worth of assistance to farmers in this province.

There have been transfers to the transfer agencies that I think were generous, given the economic circumstances of this province. Given the policies that are being adopted by the federal government and by the other provinces, clearly this government has sent a message: We have a different approach. During a recession you do not cut back on your transfer agencies, you do not cut back so that there are layoffs in the public sector; you help as much as you can and you engage yourself in other activities to create jobs as well, as we have done.

There is the employment adjustment program that the Minister of Labour announced earlier, several weeks ago, and the Fair Tax Commission, which also will have, as it makes suggestions and recommendations to the government to change the tax structure, a stimulative effect.

Those are only the items that I could remember in just the last few minutes in writing a few notes to myself, all of that in 25 or 26 weeks of government. When you compare that to the record of the previous government over its last

three years—that is right, they called an election last year. Once we got into power and we had our first few cabinet meetings and policy and priorities board meetings, one had to really understand why that election was called.

1640

Hon Mr Cooke: I do not think all of this was a coincidence, but this government has taken the resources that we were left, minimal as they are with the huge deficit we inherited, and we are doing the best job we can to help the thousands of people who have been displaced by the Conservative Party's federal government.

I think that this party and this government and the people of this province are appreciative of the honesty we put forward in telling people why we cannot proceed with some programs now and are reshifting our priorities as a government and as a party to try to create jobs and provide assistance. I can only imagine what the previous government would have done if it was reacting now in government to this horrendous economic situation in this province.

We will continue to work in partnership with people in the communities and with people in the private sector, with the trade unions of this province, to try to develop that partnership to get us through this recession and reconstruct the infrastructure of this province so that we will be able to exploit as best as possible the recovery when it comes about. But we cannot do it alone. I would certainly encourage the Conservatives who are here today to talk to their federal counterparts, see if they can talk some sense to them, and together I believe we can make it through this recession and help the people of this province.

Mr Phillips: I would hope in the end that all members of the House might support the intent of this motion, that is, to suggest there is a need for a comprehensive job creation program addressing all aspects of economic life in the province.

I predict, actually, that the government will come forward with that. I think they are going to have to, and I think that perhaps all of us today might indicate our support for that, because the situation is extremely serious. We can have a lot of fun with each other today, but the fact of the matter is that I do not think there have been as many people unemployed, in the province of Ontario certainly, in 50 years. I do not have the numbers back to the Depression of the 1930s, but if you look at least in the last 50 years, I do not think there have been as many people out of work as there are right now in the province of Ontario, about 570,000 people. I almost hate to look at statistics, because we tend here I think sometimes to lose sight of the fact that it is not a number of 570,000, it is 570,000 individuals, and one of the challenges for all of us here is to never isolate ourselves from that cruel reality of the suffering that 570,000 people are going through in this province.

As I said earlier, I can predict that it will only be a matter of weeks, certainly months at the latest, before the Premier and the Treasurer will come to this House with a program. There will be a neat name on it, Jobs for the Decade Ahead or whatever it is. But I suggest to us Jobs for the Decade, and let's get on with it.

I know we have a little bit of fun blaming the federal government. Again I would say, though, in fact Ontario is bearing the brunt of the recession. If you look at the jobs that have been lost in the country nationally, 70% of them are here in Ontario. We are suffering in Ontario. Nationally, there are challenges, but here in Ontario we are facing the brunt of it. The unemployment rate in the past 12 months is up, as the Treasurer knows, from around 6% to 10%—10.5% I think it is—and my understanding in listening to the Treasurer is that the expectation out of Treasury is that it is going to get worse before it gets better. I do not like the thought of that, because we all recognize that right now we are at a record number of people out of work, and if it is going to get worse before it gets better, obviously there are simply going to be more people in this province looking for work.

A particular aspect that worries me, and we have not talked much about it in the Legislature, is youth unemployment. If you look behind those numbers, that 570,000 I talked about, there are some extremely troublesome numbers around youth unemployment. If I might say, I think the \$700-million program that was announced by the Treasurer probably touches relatively few young people. It deals normally, I would think, with people with seniority and what not. So if we look at the young people, I am particularly troubled about that number, and I would say to all of us that if the number is bad now, as the summer comes to us I think we are going to see very significant numbers. So again I would say I would hope we do not have to wait until June before, on an emergency basis, the government comes forward with job creation programs for young people. Let's not lose sight of those young people who are and will be without jobs.

Then if you look even more carefully within some of those numbers, males for some reason or other seem to be struggling particularly poorly. The number now is about 20% among young males, 18 to 24, and it is even more significant if we look at young people who are not attending school. The unemployment rate there is 28%.

As we all wrestle and struggle with what I think is a horrendously challenging problem, let's look behind some of those numbers and appreciate that we cannot let a generation of young people be lost during these challenging times.

I think we all have heard and seen the job loss in our manufacturing sector. Again, let's recognize the engine of Ontario is our manufacturing sector. It is 21% of our jobs, it is 35% of our gross domestic product and it is a huge part of our exports. As I think all members in the House appreciate, that is one of the two sectors that have been hit most heavily. We have lost in the past 12 months at least 10% of our manufacturing jobs. All of us have seen the statistics the Ministry of Labour prepares on the difference in this recession versus the 1982 recession. In the 1982 recession, I think for a variety of reasons, plants did not close; they severely curtailed their production, often down to skeleton crews. But once the recession was over and demand began to pick up, then those jobs were still there, the factories began to run again and we were able to recover from the recession quite quickly. As we all know

now, plants are not simply slowing down and putting skeleton staffs on, they are closing. Consequently, what we face is a much more challenging situation as we try and work our way out of the recession.

The second big area of job reductions that we are facing is in the construction sector. I think, as the members will appreciate, a year ago in Ontario there were about 300,000 people working in the construction sector. That is now down to about 235,000—66,000 fewer people in the construction sector. If I am not mistaken, the anti-recession program will create about 10,000 person-years of jobs. So members can see: 66,000 fewer people in the construction sector working now; the anti-recession program might create 10,000 jobs; we still see 56,000 fewer people working in the construction sector.

Both of those are tremendously hard hit, and I believe in the construction area there is still a fair reservoir of commercial space available, some reservoir of housing available still on the marketplace, and with the industrial sector, the manufacturing sector, severely curtailed, facing some real financial problems, you can see we should not count on our manufacturing sector to help pull our construction sector out as the economy recovers.

I hope all of us in the House appreciate we are facing an enormous problem. There is more unemployed now than at least in any time that I have seen in the last 50 years or read about in the last 50 years. The manufacturing sector, historically the engine of our Ontario economy, is severely curtailed and restricted. It is very nice to blame the federal government and say it is its fault. The fact is that Ontario has seen a dramatically disproportionate impact of the recession; 70% of the lost jobs in all of Canada here in Ontario. I said before, I think this is an issue where we can have some fun with each other, where we can point fingers at each other and say, "It is the feds; it was the last government; it is this government," but the facts are that I believe the government must come forward with a program that will create permanent long-term jobs.

1650

The \$700-million anti-recession program will create 10,000 temporary person-years of work. That is important and that is a worthwhile initiative, but with 10,000 jobs in the context of 569,000 people out of work, members can see we have a much bigger problem on our hands. I can virtually guarantee it is only a matter of weeks, maybe months before the government comes forward with it, so why not do all of us today endorse this and encourage the Treasurer and the Premier to get on with it?

What should we do about it? It is easy to kind of criticize, I guess. I think the first thing is to recognize the seriousness of the problem, as I have tried to do today. I am afraid we are digging ourselves a hole that is going to take some significant time to pull ourselves out of. With all due respect, I am not aware of any announcement in this House since 1 October around permanent job creations. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology should correct me if I am wrong as he gets to his point in the rotation, but I am not aware of any time he has stood up and said, "I have today helped to conclude an agreement

between company X and a union that will create X permanent jobs."

Mr Mancini: Not a word.

Mr Phillips: Not that I am aware of. I think we should all recognize the seriousness of it.

I think the second thing is to stop blaming others, and I have tried to outline my reasons for that. I realize, as the Minister of Housing and Municipal Affairs said, "Well, we can't be quite that virtuous and we are going to blame the federal government," and we can have our fun, but let's get on to solve the problem. The Treasurer will be bringing forward his budget in the next few weeks. I would hope that that would be part of what we have advocated here and that is a comprehensive program to create jobs on all economic aspects of Ontario, as our motion says.

The fourth point I would make is one that a member from the third party made that I would suggest the members opposite really consider seriously. "Profit" is not a bad word. If you are someone who is looking to create jobs, it is a tough row to hoe right now. Why not take your money and put it into a bond? You will get 9%, 10% or 11% interest, essentially worry-free. Profit essentially is the interest that investors, entrepreneurs, people who create jobs look to as a result of their energy and their effort and their investment. I would say in all seriousness that members should not assume "profit" is a bad word. As they read the financial papers, they will be so happy to see companies actually making profit in this province they will begin to accept it as a good idea.

The reason I raise all this is that I have heard time and again in the House: "Well, we like non-profit child care. Profit child care isn't something we support. We like non-profit housing." Yes, but what about profit housing? "We like publicly run government insurance. In the nursing sector we like the non-profit sector. We don't like the profit sector."

I am saying to all of us, particularly to the members across in their caucus, "Profit is not a bad word." In fact, people who are looking to create jobs have to have it. If they do not have it, they will do one of two things, one of three things perhaps. They will invest their money in something else that simply bears interest or they will take their capital and their energies and their creativity and they will go to another jurisdiction, maybe British Columbia. British Columbia's economy is growing now. Jobs are being created there. Maybe, as all of us are worried, they will head south.

I am just saying to the members opposite in their caucus that I think many of them have a responsibility to say: Listen, maybe profit is not such a bad idea. Maybe if somebody makes 6% or 7% it is not all that bad, because they can make 10% if they invest it in bonds."

My last point is a personal one. As we deal with a global problem, I hope I am wrong, but I believe the Treasurer and the Treasury people are not anticipating we are going to pull out of this thing in the next few weeks. I think the hope is that we will at the end of the summer, but that we will not ignore the young people in this and not let a generation of young people or even a couple of years of young people suffer unduly without some focus of attention.

I am pleased to participate in the debate. As I say, I worry a lot about this. I watch very carefully what is happening in the employment sector. Ontario is going through an extremely bad patch. Some of the signs for recovery are not too clearly encouraging and some of the signs for our long term are not particularly encouraging right now. I would hope that we or the government would get on with the job of looking more broadly at job creation and that the members opposite might even consider supporting our motion to provide the necessary impetus to get on with the job creation.

Mrs Witmer: I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak to the motion that has been put forward by the member for Bruce. It has already been pointed out several times today that since 1 October, since the NDP took power in this province, we have been losing about 1,600 jobs a day. This is certainly in marked contrast to the situation in Alberta and British Columbia, where the number of jobs have actually grown.

Ontario has fallen from its traditional position as the province with the lowest unemployment rate to the fourth lowest. Ontario has the worst job creation record of any province based on the monthly employment figures. Unfortunately, all this province has offered in seven months is a \$34-million anti-recession fund for capital projects. Indeed, the Ministry of Transportation acknowledged several weeks ago that some of the grants he gave out in the last week of March were simply to offset municipal costs on projects that were already set to go.

Hon Mr Philip: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: That is not true. If you are going to quote somebody, quote them accurately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Please. Interjections are out of order. The honourable member for Waterloo North has the floor. Please resume.

Mrs Witmer: This fund has not created all the new jobs that the government has indicated it would. For example, in Cambridge it was pointed out that only half of the anti-recession grant was going to be used to create jobs that were not already in the books.

It is also important to note that three quarters of the jobs that have been lost in Canada since last February are in Ontario. This is very different from 1981-82, when jobs disappeared right across this province and this country and only one quarter were in Ontario.

Of all of the unemployed people, one out of every two workers who have lost their jobs are on permanent layoff. They have no job to return to. This again is in marked contrast to the recession in the early 1980s, when only one in five workers was laid off permanently. It is important to note that two thirds of the job losses in Ontario have been in the manufacturing sector. It is in the auto parts makers, furniture, clothing and textiles where we have seen the most unemployment. These have been the hardest-hit sectors.

1700

However, it is time we recognize that workers want jobs and not handouts. It is time to stop blaming the federal government for the job losses in Ontario and recognize that if only the federal policies were responsible for

the job loss, then the job loss would be the same in every province and not, as is the case, where in Ontario we have three quarters of the job losses.

Why is the job loss so severe in Ontario? In the past five years, 32 tax increases were introduced. This has certainly had an impact on the comparative tax advantage which Ontario corporations enjoyed, certainly in the case of the Quebec corporations. In 1985, we stood at a position of 9.6%. In 1989, this comparative tax advantage had been reduced to only 1.8%.

During the past few years the business community in Ontario has been faced with many, many new initiatives that are making this place a less competitive place to do business. We have had the employer health tax. We have had pay equity. We have had occupational health and safety legislation. These measures, combined with increasing labour costs, are some of the initiatives that have contributed to the decline in jobs and are making it difficult for Ontario business to compete on a world scale.

Unfortunately, if we continue to tax and if we continue to introduce new programs, we are going to be making ourselves less and less competitive every day and jobs will continue to disappear at the alarming rate of 1,600.

It is important to recognize that our Ontario manufacturers are going to face, in the next decade, the toughest competition they have ever faced. The globalization of world trade, combined with rapid technological change, will challenge manufacturers to adapt to rapidly changing markets.

This government must recognize that. This government must encourage the creation of an economic climate which is going to promote economic and employment growth. It must adopt the goal of making Ontario one of the most competitive and attractive investment destinations in North America. In order to do this, it must place a higher priority on the competitive impacts of all current and future legislation.

Ontario cannot afford any more tax increases. We are already more heavily taxed than our Quebec and American competitors. More taxes in the upcoming budget are going to undermine personal initiatives and encourage business to expand elsewhere, as is already happening. We see people going to the States, we see them going to other provinces, and now we have started to see them going to Mexico.

If we are to continue to enjoy the present high standard of living and our employment opportunities, and if we are going to continue to fund our social programs, it is time that government, business and labour worked together to ensure that we create an economic climate which allows Ontario to remain competitive.

Although the wage protection fund introduced today will provide protection for those who have lost jobs and will temporarily ease the pain of unemployment after the plant closes, it will not create one new job. What is this government going to do to provide incentives to business in Ontario? What is it going to do to retain and create new jobs in order that dependency on the wage protection fund will decrease in the months and the years ahead?

This government must recognize the fact that business no longer wants to locate in Ontario because this province

is no longer competitive. This province is overtaxed and it is becoming overregulated. In all that we do in the future, we need to give careful consideration to the economic impact and how it may contribute to further job loss. We need to start to ask ourselves: "Can we afford this new legislation? Will it lead to further job loss?" That is the issue. It is not whether the legislation is good or bad, but can we afford it? What are the priorities?

However, if we are going to create a favourable economic climate in this province, we need to do more. Fiscal responsibility and reduced spending should not be the sum total of our economic strategy. Education and training systems are the key to provincial prosperity and corporate success in the future. Business and labour in this province have already recognized that they must help in this endeavour.

In an age of global competition, value added products, technological change and rising international productivity, the quality of Ontario's work force will determine whether we succeed or fail. It is becoming increasingly difficult to find enough educated workers to sustain the province's industrial competitiveness. The Canadian Federation of Independent Business reports that 59% of its members in Ontario face a significant problem in finding skilled workers. According to Employment and Immigration Canada, skilled jobs cannot be filled in 300 occupations.

Unfortunately, the government has failed to develop a coherent and comprehensive human resources strategy to deal with labour force management. It is imperative that we have an effective labour force training strategy to address the growing skilled labour shortages and ensure that Ontario industry can compete in the world marketplace.

At a time of mounting economic insecurity, at a time when people in this province are suffering from a very painful loss of employment and plant closings, at a time when businesses to the south are actively recruiting us and our businesses and offering incentives to our business, this government needs to focus on stemming the tide. It needs to focus on its efforts to keep existing jobs in Ontario as well as creating an economic climate that is going to create new jobs. We need to reduce the taxes, reduce our spending. We need to provide skills training and policies that will help to keep our industries competitive.

It is time for this government to stop blaming the federal government and to take action now to prevent further job losses in this province.

Mr B. Ward: I will watch the clock here, because we have a number of other speakers as well, but I have listened intently to the debate and I feel privileged to participate at this time in the motion.

To the member for Scarborough-Agincourt and the member for Bruce, who introduced the motion, I will say that I looked at it and I have tried to find a way to be able to support it.

When we sit on the finance committee, there is always a little bit of give and take. I always try to find a way to accommodate the concerns of the members who are present. However, I just cannot support this motion, for two primary reasons, and that is unfortunate.

The first reason: I know that the opposition and the third party, the Conservative Party, will not want to hear this again, but I believe it misses its mark. Its direction is not the wrong government for lack of action. We should be focusing on the federal government.

Granted, the federal government, the Conservative government in Ottawa, through its free trade, through its deregulation, through its privatization, through its high interest rate, through its high dollar policies, has wreaked havoc on our Canadian economy. Michael Wilson, our treasurer in Ottawa, when he stated that the economy was coming in for a soft landing obviously was incorrect, because the economy has dropped like a rock. But recognizing that, we should be looking at what can be done now.

710

What has the federal government done? Michael Wilson has brought in a budget that is unfortunate. He has had a good career as a Treasurer, as some people may think, but I think he will go down as the R. B. Bennett of the 1990s.

I happen to have finished reading a book by Pierre Berton on the Depression of the 1930s, and this is exactly what the governments of that time tried to do, what the government in Ottawa is trying to do: cutting back, cutting spending. At a time when we should be stimulating the economy to try to put people back to work, they are doing the opposite, and that is exactly what happened in the 1930s.

I do not pretend to be a politician who is an MPP. I consider myself a worker who was fortunate enough to be elected by the people of Brantford to be their MPP. My friends in Brantford are working people and a lot of them are out of work, and it hurts because I know the pain that they are suffering. Working people in Brantford are proud people. They do not let on that things are troubling them, but I know they have mortgages to pay, I know they have families to feed. They do not let on that things are bothering them, but I know they do. I do not think that is right.

They know where the change has to come from. They know that, come 1992 or 1993, the next federal election, Brian Mulroney and the federal Conservative government are going to pay for what they have done to them. They are going to remember. My advice to the third party would be to do what its party has done in Alberta and cut its ties with the federal government, if it wants to remain as a party at all. That would be my advice.

That was the first part of why I cannot support—

Mr Stockwell: We don't want your advice.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Simcoe West, if you want to make any comments, you can take your chair.

Interjection.

The Deputy Speaker: So can the member for Simcoe West. The member for Brantford.

An hon member: Ask for your time back.

Mr B. Ward: Yes, I need that time back, Mr Speaker.

The second part of why I cannot support the motion, and again it is unfortunate, is that the Liberal Party, the opposition, is making references that perhaps it would be

doing more than what we are. I look at what is going on in other provinces in the country. Let's look at Newfoundland, New Brunswick, Quebec, Liberal governments in them all. What are they doing? Are they helping their working people? No, they are cutting programs. They are slashing spending.

They are not doing more to cushion the economic blows that working people are facing. They are doing less. They are doing exactly what the Conservatives are doing in Alberta and in Ottawa, and I submit that if in fact the Liberal Party was in power, it would be doing the same thing that they are doing in New Brunswick, in Newfoundland, in Quebec, in Alberta and in Ottawa: slashing and cutting.

Now let's look at what our government has done. I know members have heard this before but I am going to have to tell them again, as other speakers have, because obviously they have not heard enough. They keep asking what have we done and we keep telling them.

When we were elected we realized how bad times were, and I am not blaming the opposition party. I am not blaming them for what happened, but when we realized as a government how bad things were, our first priority was to battle the recession, and I think that is on the record. There are two ways to—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I have difficulty listening to the member, and he is right close to me, so I would ask you to please reserve your comments. Give him a chance to speak. The member for Brantford.

Mr B. Ward: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Mr Ruprecht: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I did not get elected to this House to come here and listen to political propaganda.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much. This is not a point of order. The member for Brantford.

Mr B. Ward: If I may continue, Mr Speaker, what have we done? We look at the economy, at short-term solutions and long-term solutions. Short-term and immediate was to put the people of Ontario back to work to the best of our ability as a government. We implemented the \$700-million capital works program which, I may add, is not simply to dig holes and hire people to fill them; it is to rebuild our infrastructure in our province which has been neglected for years.

My city of Brantford has received over \$4 million of that anti-recession capital works program, and when you add that to the \$7 million that the municipality chipped in, that is over \$11 million of capital works that went to create short-term work. I think that is of benefit to the tradespeople who are unemployed, to the people who have faced possible unemployment because of the recession.

Next, we realize as a government that people fall off the UI safety net and they fall into social assistance. That is the next layer. So what did we do in the short term? We bumped it up by 7% to attempt at least to put some money into the pockets of the people who are on social assistance. The wage protection fund was announced today by the Minister of Labour. I almost forgot about the \$50 million

in short-term interest relief to the farmers, which was duly recognized by the member of the third party, and I thank her for that.

What else have we done? In any recession, we have apprentices who are laid off. Unfortunately in any economy, apprentices are usually the last to be hired and the first to be fired or laid off in any type of downturn. We realize that what happened in the last recession was that the apprentices were drifting out of the system. Since they were no longer being trained, they were drifting out into other jobs or dropping out altogether, and when the recovery occurred, there was a lack of skilled workers to meet the recovery needs. So what have we done to keep apprentices in the system? We have announced a \$6-million assistance program to laid-off apprentices in an effort to keep them in the system, to keep their training ability there so that the apprentices will be there when the recovery comes, and recovery will come.

Let's talk about some of the long-term solutions that we may have. Let's look at skills development. We realize as a government that the old ways will no longer work any more. The adversarial approach is no longer good enough. It has not suited our province, our country. We all have to learn to work together as business, labour and all governments. These are very tough times. What are we doing as a government when it comes to skills development? We recognize that to meet the new growth industries that are going to occur, we have to ensure that we have the skilled workforce in this province to meet that growth.

We cannot save all the plants. We have to recognize that some industries will die—that is a natural progression—but we have to figure out where the growth is going to occur. To do that we have to learn to work together: labour, business and government. That is what we are trying to foster, a new way of doing things, a new co-operation in this province which has been lacking in the past. What we hope to do is to develop a new way that skills will be presented in this province, and we think we can accomplish that in our term of government.

As well, we have announced the Fair Tax Commission to attempt to look at how taxes are implemented in this province and to give us ideas on how we can have a fairer tax system where everyone pays a fair share in this province. That has never been done either.

Those are long term. I would like to think that in this House during these tough times, perhaps we can learn to work together a little bit better than we are, because I really believe it is going to take the input and the give and take from both sides. I recognize it is the job of the opposition and the third party to criticize, that is fair game, but I hope they criticize in a positive manner and not just for the sake of criticizing. Give us some good ideas. We are listening as a government. We realize that it is going to take everyone's co-operation to pull us out of this recession. When times are good, perhaps we can go back to the old ways, but I hope we do not.

In closing, because we have other speakers who want to share the time, I reject the vision of the Conservatives in Ottawa and in this province that we should begin to dismantle our social network in this province and in this

country, that we slash our programs, that we have an American-type society where it is dog eat dog: "I'm all right, Jack. Who cares about my neighbour."

I hope we will continue to build a society that was the vision of Tommy Douglas, one of our past leaders, a vision that was built on a society of caring and compassion for each other. I believe our government is committed to building that society and I know the people of Ontario are with us.

Mr Mancini: One barely knows where to begin. We have sat across from the government today in question period waiting for answers, we have sat across from the government all of this afternoon waiting for answers and we have received none. All we hear from the government, now that it has received the responsibility of office and power, is it cannot do anything and we have to wait the recession out.

1720

We will not be able to end the food banks, as they promised last summer. They were sure they could do it. They knew there was a recession on. Now they cannot end the food banks. They were sure last summer they could prevent plant closings. This afternoon, just a moment or two ago, we heard from the member for Brantford. We heard his own words. He said, yes, there would be plant closures, and we would have to accept it. Where is the legislation that has been promised over the years and specifically last year and all of last summer, which gave the impression to thousands upon thousands of Ontario voters that these people across the floor could pass legislation to prevent plant closures?

The economy is in a tailspin. It has been for a number of months and they have done nothing. I want to illustrate to the House who is suffering. The previous speaker's own riding is suffering. I want to remind the member across the floor that Solaray of Brantford closed on 21 December 1990, putting 120 people out of work. That company was a division of Sunbeam Corp. Did we hear from anybody about the Solaray employees who were turfed out on the street? Not a word from the New Democratic Party and its government.

The following are closures which were reported in the report on permanent and indefinite layoffs in Ontario for December 1990 that was compiled by the Ministry of Labour, their own department, so they know what is going on. They just want to hide from the facts. They know that in London Somerville Packaging is closed, 160 workers out of work. They know that Stanley Home Automation in Windsor is closed, 11 people out of work. They know that Therm-O-Disc (Canada) of St Thomas is closed, putting 100 people out of work. They know that the Hunt-Wesson plant in Tilbury has closed, putting 57 people out of work. In February of this year, they know that NHS Die Casting and W. G. Castings of Dresden are closed, putting 53 people out of work.

There are many whys. We want action from the government. It had all of the promises. It got all of the votes. Now it must deliver. They cannot run away from their responsibilities, and if they think we are going to sit here

and let them cower and hide underneath this fancy red rug we are sitting next to, then they have another think coming.

Nabisco Brands in Leamington closed, putting 87 people out of work. My friend the member for Chatham-Kent has a lot to say this afternoon, except for the unemployed. He is speaking for the Motor Wheel Corp, which put 191 people out of work? Have we heard from him about those 191 families that are suffering? Not a word.

Fiberglas Canada in Sarnia—where is the member for Sarnia?—put 191 people out of work. At Chicago Rawhide Products in Brantford—is the member familiar with this institution? Is the member aware that 133 people have been now put out of work? Did we hear anything about that during the member's speech? Did the member say anything? Did the member say a word?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the member for Downsview please take his seat? Thank you.

Mr Mancini: These people produced during the election campaign the Agenda for People. Let me read into the record what the Premier had to say in Windsor on 4 September 1990, just two days before a certain event: "Asked later to explain what he would do for unemployed workers, Rae repeated the NDP pledge to spend. He said he would spend \$1.8 billion over two years on a 'detailed plan' to save jobs and turn around the Ontario economy." Where is the plan?

We want to know from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology, where is the detailed plan to save jobs, to turn the Ontario economy around? Can any ministers in the House tell us if they have been consulted on this plan? Can the member for Brantford tell us whether he has been consulted? How about the member for Chatham-Kent? Has he consulted on the plan? How about the member for Downsview? Was he consulted on the plan, the \$1.8-billion detailed plan?

How about the Premier's promise to tear up the free trade agreement? Let me just inform the House. In the Toronto Star, 25 August 1990, the Premier was in the Port Elgin area, a direct quote from the Premier, "The free trade agreement would be torn up by the NDP." Torn up. That is what he said. Let me tell the House what else the Premier said during the month of August and on that particular day. The Premier said the following—he had all the answers then; he said, "We would not in any way, shape or form be bound by the agreement and we would continue to provide assistance to industry and to farmers and to others."

Mr Bradley: Who said that?

Mr Mancini: The Premier said that. He said that around the Port Elgin area.

This is not the first time Ontario has gone through a recession. We have been through recessions before and governments in the past have dealt with recessions. During the 1981-82 recession the NDP at the time, now the government, released a number of documents about what it could do if it had the responsibility of government. It was during the last recession. I want to particularly remind the members who were here during that time and to inform all the new members so that they understand what their

obligations are: Their obligations are to keep their promise. Keep their promise; that is their obligation.

Just by coincidence I have with me a press release dated 5 July 1982 sent out by no less a person than the present Treasurer himself. I want to read into the record the Treasurer's view on what should be done during hard times, which have now become known as NDP times. The then member of the opposition said:

"Today I am introducing a bill in the Ontario Legislature to protect home owners when they are laid off, on strike or locked out. My bill would allow home owners to postpone mortgage payments for as long as they were on strike or locked out, plus three months after the strike or lockout had ended. In case of a layoff, mortgage payments could be deferred for the period of the layoff and three months after. If the layoff were indefinite or permanent, the moratorium would be in effect for six months."

The Treasurer stated at that particular moment: "It is time Ontario served notice that homes belong to the people who live in them, not the banks. Let's keep families in their homes." I want to know from the NDP government, the socialist government across the floor, what it has done to protect the people who have been laid off at a rate of 1,600 a day. What has it done in order to pursue the promise that was made to keep people in their homes and to keep the bankers out of their homes?

What have they done? They have done nothing. After seven months in office, they have completely abandoned their responsibility. All they were interested in were the votes. That is all they were interested in. They wanted the votes. They got the power. Now they are just sitting across the floor, very comfortable. They sit in those big chairs across the floor, very comfortable, and in a few minutes, after six o'clock, the ministers' limousines will line up at the east wing and they will all be whisked away because they have worked so hard today.

1730

Mr Stockwell: Remember what it was like? Jealous?

Mr Jackson: It took him so long to get one.

Mr Mancini: This is not a laughing matter.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, I am losing all my time.

The Deputy Speaker: Will the member for Lake Nipigon take his seat, please, and the member for Downsview.

Mr Mancini: The member for Quinte, my colleague who sits next to me in the House, has asked the government on a regular basis to be more sensitive to eastern Ontario. His pleas for help have fallen on deaf ears. Yes, the government refused to listen; it refused to act. My colleague has reminded me of what the Liberal government did for eastern Ontario. He has reminded me that a new Sears plant went to Belleville. My colleague reminded me that a new Goodyear plant went to Napanee. My colleague the member for Quinte reminded me that a new Coca-Cola plant went to Belleville.

Now absolutely no attention is being placed on the affairs and concerns of the people of eastern Ontario. We have a situation here where the government is paralysed. We have a government that is paralysed into inaction by fear. They are afraid to move. They are afraid to implement their promises. They only respond when they have to, and at best very weakly.

We cannot wait much longer, day after day, for the 1982 promises of the Treasurer to be implemented. We cannot wait for the Agenda for People. My colleague the member for St Catharines tells me that document is now in the fiction section of the library. We cannot wait for ever. The unemployed cannot wait for ever for those people to get up the nerve to actually govern. They must assume the responsibility that they so much wanted only a few months ago. They visited community after community. They made promises after promises. We are waiting for them to deliver. We are waiting for the \$1.8-billion detailed plan that was promised in Windsor.

I am going to give the Premier the benefit of the doubt. I am not going to do what the member for Windsor-Riverside did last year and call another honourable member a liar. I am not going to do that. I am going to give the Premier the benefit of the doubt. I believe he was telling the truth. I believe there is a detailed plan of \$1.8 billion that will save and protect jobs and turn the economy around. What I want to know is when we can see this plan.

Mr Stockwell: I have a philosophical difficulty with the motions put on the order paper today by the Liberal Party. It is a difficulty with respect to job creation. We have had unemployment, plant closures and layoffs, and we have to re-evaluate our situation. There have been a lot of complaints about the job creation programs and the expenditures that this government has made.

The difficulty I have is philosophical. I do not believe that government can create jobs by itself. Government does not create jobs; it simply creates new taxes, in my opinion. Every time they hire somebody, it is another form of tax and they have to go back to businesses and individuals and ask them to pay for the person whom they have hired. What creates jobs is a healthy environment from a healthy economy, a healthy environment from a healthy tax base, a healthy environment from a good supply of workers. This creates jobs, this creates taxes, this creates quality of life.

The difficulty that I think this government has is that this particular Ontario economy is not healthy. Why is it not healthy? It is simply overtaxed, overburdened and people expect far more in the way of taxes from this particular business community than anywhere else in this country.

The programs that have been enunciated by the present government talk of a \$700-million job creation program. My friends, that is not creating jobs. The people who create jobs are the private sector. The private sector creates jobs from opening businesses. That is called new wealth.

By the government simply taxing the public and redistributing it out in government work is not creating new dollars. The new dollars come from the business community. The business community can only flourish if it is allowed to flourish in a healthy economy, and healthy

economies do not include new forms of taxes every time the government redrafts the budget.

The Treasurer, I am sure, will be coming out with new taxes and new deficit figures. This is going to be another nail in the coffin of the Ontario economic future. We have seen tax increases, double-digit increases, for the past five years. We are probably going to look at a government that is going to increase taxes and increase spending far more than the previous government, which does not create a healthy economy.

Folks, the government does not create jobs; it does not create any jobs. Any time the government wants to offer a new program that calls for new taxes, it is nailing another nail into that coffin that the private sector is having to face these days.

Hon Mr Philip: Tell that to Michael Wilson. Why didn't you tell that to your federal buddy Michael Wilson?

Mr Stockwell: Mr Philip, you continue to go on about your job creation programs, your job creation programs that you said publicly were not going to create any new jobs. What a farce. You have not created one job in your life. You continue sucking tax dollars out of the private sector, redistributing those and standing up and chanting about what a wonderful job you are doing.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Address your remarks to the Chair.

Mr Stockwell: I apologize.

It is not a wonderful job the government is doing. It is simply putting the private sector at an uncompetitive disadvantage to all other sectors around it. If we had a healthy economy, we would get relocation of jobs. If we had a healthy economy, we would get plant openings. If we had a healthy economy, the plants that are closing and leaving town would not be doing so.

It is a fool's paradise to think that we can create a healthy economy by taxing and taxing business to death. The one distinct difference between the government of the day and the previous government and this party is, when the government talks about job creation programs addressing all aspects of economic life, I believe if it wants to have a job creation program, wants to have a healthy employment level, wants to have a healthy tax level, wants to create a quality of life in this province, it has to get out of the private sector, quit taxing it to death, leave it alone because for 42 years it was quite capable of keeping the people in this province employed until those people got tired and started messing it up.

Mr Ferguson: If members are not confused at this point, then very clearly they are not paying attention to what is being said in the House this afternoon.

To understand where we are at this point, I think what we have to do is understand where this province has been. In the last election, this party did not bus and barbecue its way across the province of Ontario, giving out a promise the Liberal way. We did not undertake to the people of Ontario that we would dramatically reduce taxes, because we were upfront with them and we told them that in fact bringing services to people in this province costs money and

here are very few ways you can raise money other than taxes.

I think we were very upfront with people, but we also undertook to do certain things upon being elected, and upon assuming office we were very straight with the people of Ontario. We told them that given the economic realities of the day, we would not be able to do everything as quickly as we would like to do.

What is important in this motion is not just what it says, but what is implied in the motion and what it does not say. What the motion implies is that somehow, magically, at midnight on 6 September 1990, this recession began. That is what is implied in the motion.

What the motion implies is that somehow magically at midnight on 6 September 1990 this recession began. That is what is implied in the motion.

740

The other thing that is implied in the motion is that one should not have any regard at all for the deficit of the province and that we should go out and create jobs regardless of what the deficit could be. That is the other issue that is implied in this motion.

The third item that is inferred in this motion is that this national recession that not only this province but other provinces across this country find themselves in is somehow the collective responsibility of the province of Ontario. That is the other false implication in this motion.

They do not have to take our word for it. I ask the members opposite to consult with the president of one of the larger manufacturing concerns in my riding, the president of Epton Industries, an individual by the name of Michael Weedon. Recently this individual had to lay off 50 people in his plant, and he cited three reasons. He did not cite that, "We had to lay off people as a result of the New Democrats being elected on 6 September," but what he did say, very clearly, not only publicly in a news release but privately in conversation with me as well as privately in written correspondence, was that there are three main factors: the high dollar, the free trade agreement and the high interest rate policy of this country. Those are what he cited as the three main factors adversely affecting his industry.

This government recognizes that much has yet to be done, that in fact we do have many challenges ahead of us as a government, and in order to combat this recession that we have done is put forth a program that I think makes sense and creates meaningful employment in every area in every sector in the province of Ontario. Let me suggest to you that we do face challenges, and we are not finished yet. This is not the end, my friends, but this is just the very beginning of where we plan to go.

In conclusion, let me say that we, like every other province, have been the victims of the federal government's destructive, regressive, mean-spirited economic policy that fights the recession on the backs of the workers of this country. That is where we are at this point.

Might I also add that this party in fact is going to recognize the economic realities of today. We recognize the economic realities of today, but we are going to act very responsibly and we are never going to lose sight of

the fact that we are the party of this province that has the social conscience.

Mr Malkowski: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: A few minutes ago the member for Essex South made a comment about falling on deaf ears. I do not feel that is an appropriate comment in this House. He is the former minister of the Office for Disabled Persons. He should know better than to use terminology like that.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to say that I did not pay particular attention to what the member for Essex South said.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. But I will make a point of reading the Hansard to see if there were any derogatory remarks, and if there were, I am positive that the member for Essex South would be the first one to apologize. Who is the next member?

Mr Callahan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like just to say one thing. I think this entire debate is summed up in one—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for Essex South.

Mr Mancini: The member is correct. I did use those words and I was the Ontario minister for disabled persons for more than two years. During my time as minister I met the honourable member on a number of occasions prior to his entering partisan politics and entering this House. I met with hundreds of organizations across the province to push forward the needs and concerns of persons with all disabilities. Never, prior to my being appointed minister, during my term as minister nor since my term as minister, have I ever been accused of saying anything derogatory concerning persons with disabilities.

I believed at the time I was using something that was a colloquial term. It was not meant to be offensive in any way. If the member is concerned that I used those words, I regret that. I retract them without condition, and I can only say that if anyone else is offended, I sincerely apologize to each and every person who feels such an offence and in the future I will be more careful with the words I use.

As minister responsible for disabled persons, the honourable member will remember that I initiated and presented to the general public terms and references and words that could be used in describing issues that affect disabled people, and I hope the member recalls that.

The Deputy Speaker: As far as I am concerned, this matter is closed. Do you have a point of order?

Hon Mr Laughren: I wanted to express my appreciation to everyone who took part in the debate this afternoon. I know that I will embarrass him by saying it, but I wanted to pay special tribute to my parliamentary assistant, the member for Hamilton Centre, who has been such a help to me over the last six months.

I appreciate the fact that the member for Bruce put forward this motion as an opposition day. I think that it is an important motion, because there is no question that the most important problem facing the province today is the

recession that we find ourselves in and the level of unemployment.

Mr Jackson: You just don't want to talk about the economy in Hamilton-Wentworth, do you: \$200 million cancelled, jobs cancelled, you've got your best friend running for mayor.

Hon Mr Laughren: There is absolutely no question about that, and I only wish the member for Burlington South cared as much about it as some of his colleagues do, or he would not be nattering on the way he is now.

Mr Jackson: I care about you turning your back on Hamilton-Wentworth region and you know it. Stop being such a cheap Treasurer with Hamilton-Wentworth.

Hon Mr Laughren: If the member for Burlington South wants to make his cheap political points, he can do so, but I would suggest that he would be better off to take part in this serious debate about the level of unemployment in the province of Ontario.

The province of Ontario slipped into a recession in about the second quarter of 1990. Ever since that time the numbers have been disturbing, to say the least, and in the last year there has been a loss of about 260,000 jobs in the province. That is an extremely disturbing set of numbers, and what is even more disturbing than that, in the 1982 recession the loss of jobs was slightly less than that but most of the jobs in 1982 were temporary losses of jobs. About a quarter of the job losses 10 years ago were temporary. Today two thirds of all the job losses of those 260,000 appear to be permanent job losses, and that is an extremely worrisome aspect of the current recession.

I must say that last fall when the Legislature first met after the new government was sworn in, we acted as quickly as we possibly could. We took a number of initiatives. Some of the initiatives, to be fair, were started by the previous government but the legislation was never passed. There was the current cost allowance: The bill had been introduced but had never been debated and had never been passed, so this government decided it was appropriate to proceed with that current cost adjustment.

1750

Second, we decided as well that the accelerated, super research and development, the R and D allowance, should as well be put in place because that would encourage R and D at a time when it was most needed. The Ontario tax reduction program, which the previous government introduced, we also carried on. But I will tell members, the biggest thing we did was to immediately launch a \$700-million anti-recession package. That program resulted in over 3,000 individual projects being undertaken; 22 different ministries were involved, 14,000 person-years of employment were created with that program. I want to tell members there is not another government in this entire country that had a program that even came close to being as aggressive as our anti-recession program, not one.

Of course, we understand very well that while an anti-recession package that creates 14,000 person-years of jobs—as a matter of fact, it is closer to 20,000 when you build in the local component, the municipalities, the school boards and so forth that helped in those projects—we

know that with 260,000 job losses in the last year that does not go a long way to resolving the problems out there. We knew at the same time that we could not do it all. We knew that if we had tried to move much more quickly than we did, the members opposite would have been the first ones on their feet to say we should not be spending so much money, that the recession was temporary and that we should allow the recession to run its course, do what we could but not get the province in too deep hock. We think that we walked the proper line.

I must say at the same time that because of the unemployment numbers and—I almost hesitate to say this because of the reaction it will provoke on the other side—because of changes in the federal unemployment insurance program, we knew as well that the welfare rolls were going to be surging even more, even higher than they would otherwise be doing. So we needed to do a couple of things to protect not only people whose jobs would be lost, but whose unemployment insurance would run out faster than it would otherwise do. For those reasons, in January 1991 we increased the shelter allowance 10% and we increased the level of benefits 7%. There already was built in a 5% increase on the level of benefits and a 5% increase on the shelter allowance. We doubled the shelter allowance and increased the level of benefits by another 2%. That was to help alleviate the misery somewhat for those people who find themselves requiring social assistance.

As well, today in this Legislature I was very proud when I sat here and listened to the Minister of Labour stand in his place and introduce the wage protection fund. I cannot think of anything that sends a stronger signal to the people of this province that this government cares about people. When companies go out of business, we are there to help them at a time of need.

That is not all we have done. We have established a labour management adjustment committee. The Minister of Labour has announced a \$7.5-million program for that. For retraining, education and literacy he has announced money—\$25 million. This government has not been sitting on the sidelines, as some members opposite would imply. I would challenge the members opposite to judge our actions in the face of a recession with any jurisdiction in this country. No one comes close to what we have done.

I understand very well the frustration of the members opposite and with the members of the official opposition. I listen to them day after day telling us two things: One, we are not doing enough, and two, we are not moving fast enough. I want to say it is fine for the members of the official opposition to rail against what we are not doing or what we are doing too slowly, but we are the ones who have to live with the commitments we make, not those over there. We are determined to move with prudence. We are determined that what we will do, we will do very carefully and we are more concerned with doing things right than we are with doing them quickly. That is a firm commitment we make to the people of the province.

I hear the members of the third party talk and I think back to another era. I actually think back, not to the 1980s not the 1970s, not to the 1960s, not to the 1950s or the 1940s, I think back to the 1930s. That is what I think back

o, because I hear members of the third party day after day saying that the answer to combating the recession is simply to make the recession worse. That is what they are trying to tell us to do.

We know the problems in Ontario are serious. We are prepared to roll up our sleeves and work with everybody in the province, the business community, the municipalities, the labour movement, to make sure we do what we can in the face of the worst recession we have had since the 1930s. It is important that we do not regard those people out there as our adversaries. We want to work with them.

I do not believe simply cutting back the way the third party would have us do, the way Mr Wilson and Mr Mulroney would have us do, is the answer at all. Do members know what the Conservatives believe in? They believe when you are in a recession, you climb into a bunker and you declare war on the public service in the province. That is simply not on. We are determined we can work our way out of this recession. We know as well that simply cutting back all of those services that are well in place in the province at the time that people most need them is not the way we intend to do it. That is not the way we are going to govern in Ontario.

I want to tell members I do understand the frustration. Opposite, I want to tell them we understand the problems of the province and we are going to work very hard to resolve them, but we are going to do it in a sense of partnership with people all across the province.

Ontario has an economy that is resilient. We know it is still the best jurisdiction anywhere to invest in and we believe the investment community believes in that as well. We have no doubt about that whatsoever.

Once again, I just want to close by thanking all of the members who took part in the debate. I can tell them we were listening very carefully to everything they had to say.

The Speaker: Despite the high level of interest shown in this item, the time allotted for the consideration of the matter has expired.

1805

The House divided on Mr Elston's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes—30

Beer, Bradley, Callahan, Carr, Cordiano, Cunningham, Curling, Elston, Eves, Harris, Henderson, Jackson, Mahoney, Mancini, McClelland, McGuinty, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neil, H., Phillips, G., Poole, Ruprecht, Sola, Sorbara, Stockwell, Sullivan, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Nays—65

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Martel, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: The schedule next week: There will be further consideration of matters relating to Bill 4. On Thursday 18 April there are two private member's bills, the first standing in the name of Mr Chiarelli and the second standing in the name of Mr Jordan.

The House adjourned at 1810.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Service
			minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Ampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
ansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
arnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
arrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
arris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
aslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
ayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
enderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
ope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
uget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
ackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
amison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
ohnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
ordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
lopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
ormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
winter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
ankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
aughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
essard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
IacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
acKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
ahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
alkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
ammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
ancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
archese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
arland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
artel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
artin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
athyssen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
McClash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
ills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	
lorin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
			Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
orrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
urdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
urdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
ixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
orth, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Wininger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Temba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Ron Hansen, Karen Haslam, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Margery Ward, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Winter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Sharon Murdoch, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Liaison

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Noel Duignan, Joan M. Fawcett, James Henderson, Bob Huget, George Mammoliti, Irene Mathysen, Bill Murdoch, Paul Wessinger, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Brian A. Charlton, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Paul R. Johnson, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Bob Huget
 Vice-chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, Brian A. Charlton, Marilyn Churley, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Marilyn Churley, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Irene Mathysen
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 11 April 1991

Private members' public business		
Powers of Attorney Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 7	609	
Mr Sterling	609	
Agreed to	623	
Natural Death Act, 1990, Bill 8	609	
Mr Sterling	609	
Mr Winner	610	
Mr Daigeler	611	
Mr Arnott	612	
Mr Owens	613	
Mr Sorbara	613	
Mr Carr	614	
Mr Silipo	614	
Mr Jordan	615	
Agreed to	623	
Wetland protection, resolution 10	616	
Mr Wiseman	616	
Mr Ramsay	617	
Mr McLean	618	
Mr Waters	619	
Mrs Sullivan	619	
Mr Villeneuve	621	
Mr White	621	
Mr G. Wilson	622	
Agreed to	623	
Members' statements		
Child care centres	624	
Mrs Sullivan		
Hunting in Algonquin Park	624	
Mr McLean		
Shelter for women	624	
Mr O'Connor		
Community police centres	624	
Mr McGuinty		
Education	625	
Mrs Cunningham		
Signs of Hope conference	625	
Mr Waters		
Question period	625	
Mr Phillips		
Affordable housing	625	
Mr Tilson		
Employment equity	626	
Mr Malkowski		
Statements by the ministry		
Wage protection	627	
Mr Mackenzie		
Business practices	628	
Ms Churley		
Community Justice Week	628	
Mr Hampton		
Responses		
Wage protection	629	
Mr Nixon		
Community Justice Week	629	
Mr Sorbara		
Wage protection	629	
Mrs Witmer		
Community Justice Week	630	
Mr Harris		
Oral questions		
Job security	630	
Mr Nixon		
Mr Rae		
Unemployment	632	
Mr Nixon		
Mr Pilkey		
Public safety	633	
Mr Harris		
Mr Farnan		
Mr Runciman		
Unemployment	635	
Mr Bradley		
Mr Pilkey		
Health care	635	
Mr Eves		
Ms Gigantes		
Pork industry	636	
Mr Hansen		
Mr Buchanan		
Unemployment in Northern Ontario	636	
Mrs McLeod		
Miss Martel		
Pornography	637	
Mr Jackson		
Ms Churley		
Race relations	638	
Mr Owens		
Ms Ziemba		
Petitions		
Highway construction	638	
Mr Abel		
Animals for research	638	
Mr Malkowski		
Landfill site	638	
Mr Hayes		

First readings	Job creation, motion 1 (continued)
Employment Standards Amendment Act (Employee Wage Protection Program), 1991, Bill 70	Mrs Fawcett 644
Mr Mackenzie	Mr J. Wilson 646
Agreed to 639	Mr Cooke 648
auramar Holdings Limited Act, 1991, Bill Pr3	Mr Phillips 649
Mr Henderson	Mrs Witmer 651
Agreed to 639	Mr B. Ward 652
representation Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 71	Mr Mancini 654
Mr Tilson	Mr Stockwell 656
Agreed to 639	Mr Ferguson 656
own of Oakville Act, 1991, Bill Pr24	Mr Laughren 657
Mr Carr	Negatived 659
Agreed to 639	
ity of Toronto Act, 1991, Bill Pr64	Other business
Mr Silipo	
Agreed to 639	Time allocation 626
	The Speaker
Opposition Day	Business of the House 659
	Miss Martel
Job creation, motion 1 639	Adjournment 659
Mr Elston 640	
Mr Carr 641	Lists of members
Mr Christopherson 643	
	Members and their responsibilities 660
	Committees of the Legislative Assembly 663

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 11 avril 1991

Première lecture	Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur la représentation
Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur les normes d'emploi,	électorale, projet de loi 71 639
(Programme de protection des salaires des employés),	M. Tilson
projet de loi 70 639	Adoptée 639
M. Mackenzie	
Adoptée 639	



6 1991

16 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 15 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 15 avril 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 15 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

HEALTH CARE

Mr Henderson: In an era of prevalent doctor-bashing, I want to pay tribute to a very courageous doctor and patient who made history of sorts this Christmas in Parry Sound.

Clarence Draper is a 75-year-old gentleman who was taken to Parry Sound District General Hospital on Christmas Eve with no blood pressure and no pulse because of a ruptured aortic aneurysm, a bursting of a balloon-like dilation in the main artery carrying blood under high pressure out of the heart. Dr Denys Hunt and his colleagues at the Parry Sound hospital set aside the temptingly safe but certain to be fatal course of sending Mr Draper to Toronto and performed a life-saving aortic aneurysm graft in Parry Sound.

Undertaking such surgery away from a specialist centre on a patient with no blood pressure and no pulse is a bit like repairing the engine of a DC-8 while the aircraft is plummeting towards the earth. Mr Draper owes his life to the skill and courage of Dr Hunt, to the Parry Sound surgical team, to the dedication of the nurses on the third floor, to his wife and daughters who provided round-the-clock intensive care following surgery, and of course to his own courage, faith and fortitude.

I want to applaud the courage, skill and compassion of the Parry Sound surgical team: Doctors Hunt, McFarland, Cooke, Donovan and Hunkin, and everyone else who participated in this surgical miracle.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr Cousens: Today is an unusual day in that I want to extend my appreciation to the Minister of Transportation.

[Applause]

Mr Cousens: Once in a while he will even get a clap from me.

This is the third Minister of Transportation I have pursued this issue with and until now have had a negative response, even from him in the early stages until the arm-twisting reached such excruciating pain for him last week that he had no choice but to use his common sense and do what was right.

I want to stand up in this House and extend my sincere appreciation and the appreciation of those people in Unionville who have been trying to present their case for some time to have a traffic light on Highway 7. Yes, another traffic light on Highway 7. The people of Unionville are in a position where they cannot get across the street because of the traffic. We need to have some way in which they can get to the bus stop and so that they can get out and get a haircut, so that they can get out of their place and do something.

Mr Mahoney: A haircut?

Mr Cousens: Well, I have had them before too. I remember what it was like to carry a comb; never mind. But the people of Unionville are better off than I am when it comes to that stuff.

It is just the fact that we in this province have to make sure that life is accessible to everybody. They were locked into this institution and could not get across the road. Now, because of everyone working together, the town of Markham, the seniors—Anna Russell, Dennis Robbins, Margaret McLean, John Wilson—the people in the shops at Unionville and the people in Markham, they have made it happen, and I thank the Minister of Transportation for helping out.

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

Mr White: I rise to speak about the national dialogue presently taking place, which focuses on the very nature and future of Canada.

I had the opportunity recently of observing a forum held in Whitby. It was an interesting and important opportunity for people to exchange views, to help inform our community. We can only hope that these exchanges are to be part of a national dialogue which is intricately linked to the renegotiation and renewal of our national community. Like our own hearings of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, the debate was lively and stimulating.

If such forums are only a preliminary and time-killing ruse, however, the hope and trust of the nation will again be dashed. If the later stages and the very decision-making process leaves out such direct consultation, then Canadians will again be disheartened and alienated by their very own political structures. The healing process that takes part in here does not end with initial exchange. Our whole community must be involved in setting goals and in solving the problems they have reached an impasse with.

I believe we need a positive vision of what our country and institutions stand for. Further, I believe this can only be achieved through a real involvement of the Canadian peoples in this vision. Only together can we join in the forging of a new consensus. Only with a real national dialogue throughout the entirety of this process can we reach this goal.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr Phillips: On behalf of myself and my colleague the member for Scarborough North, I would like to bring to the attention of the House this serious matter of hate literature distribution in Scarborough.

I think each of us has a vision of our Canada. I view it as a flower garden. Canada has been fortunate initially to have a beautiful flower, our native community, and then over the life of this country we have been able to attract from around the world the best of the flowers: the English and the French and the Greeks and the Italians, and of course from Asia, from India, from Korea, from the Philippines,

from China. Now I think we have perhaps the most beautiful flower garden in the world, and indeed it is a role model for the world, but like with any flower garden, periodically a weed creeps in.

Right now we have such a weed and it is called racism and hate literature. Someone in Scarborough is distributing hate literature.

It is a vicious weed; it is spreading lies. Our Chinese community is a wonderful community, as the members know. It is a cowardly weed in that it attacks anonymously in the middle of the night with unsigned letters. It is a weed that I think all of us must attack, for while right now it is attacking our Asian community, it surely will spread if it is not checked.

For the province's part, I would hope that both our new race relations secretariat and the Human Rights Commission will apply the full strength of their operation to rout out this vicious Ontario weed as quickly as we possibly can.

1340

ELECTRICITY DEMAND AND SUPPLY

Mr Jordan: The Minister of Energy is continuing to shadow the need for immediate planning for new generation through conservation, demand management, environmental protection and non-utility generation. Industries are worried the provincial government's electricity saving projections of over 6,000 megawatts are too ambitious and Ontario will face even higher electricity costs and supply shortages in the mid-1990s.

The president of Falconbridge Ltd is very concerned. "If Ontario can sustain its economy and preserve the jobs of its people while phasing out nuclear generation, that's all well and good. But the government and the advocates of this course of action had better be very, very careful of the consequences if the approach is wrong. It will not just be wrong, it'll be disastrously wrong and ruinously wrong," he told 150 members of the Association of Major Power Consumers of Ontario.

When you are into a big energy consumption type of business, you are going to look to the area where you can get the best deal on power. This is no time to take entrenched, ideological positions. This issue has implications that transcend ideology. Is it not time the minister came forward with policy and leadership for the future of this province?

WINE INDUSTRY

Ms Harrington: The government of Ontario is pleased to support Ontario's grape growers and wineries in their efforts to promote Ontario wines. The members may have seen the new commercials on television this past week. We encourage Ontario consumers to buy Ontario-made wines. We ask restaurants and hotels to show support by highlighting and promoting these products in their businesses. All members of the House have an opportunity to promote Ontario wines by asking that they be served instead of imported wines at events which we sponsor.

Ontario wines are winning international awards and are being lauded by expert wine connoisseurs in Europe. In

Niagara Falls recently, this past month, we had a grand cuvée, which was a very elegant affair. It was a competition for Ontario wineries.

We are proud that Ontario wines have come of age, and on behalf of the industry we invite people to visit the wine regions of Ontario, especially Niagara. Speaking of visiting Niagara Falls, it is almost blossom time, and that is another good reason to visit Niagara.

On behalf of the government of Ontario, I salute our province's grape growers and vintners and ask that members of the House encourage their constituents to support this important sector of our agricultural community.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Last Friday the member for Mississauga North, the member for Brampton North and I travelled to Windsor on a fact-finding mission regarding the cross-border shopping crisis in that community.

What we saw and heard first hand is a courageous struggle by municipal leaders and small businesses to lead a fight, without any offer of aid or assistance from this NDP government, against an American retail system deliberately structured to pick them off one by one.

The people in Windsor have suggestions, as do people in the other devastated border communities: suggestions for solutions that could be implemented this summer at the height of our tourist season; suggestions that would give them the kind of level playing field needed to prove their ability to compete. They also know that only two obstacles stand in their way: this NDP government and their Tory cousins in Ottawa.

In Windsor they know the NDP continues to refuse to help them regain their competitive edge, saying it would cost the province too much money to review, revise or improve various components of the tax system. In Windsor they know it is costing the province too much and the people know it is costing them their very livelihood and their jobs not to review the tax system.

The people of Windsor have enlisted the co-operation of a professor from the University of Windsor to collect new data that will prove to their own provincial government that a crisis does exist. I hope the NDP government will listen to this new data and that it will act before it is too late for that community.

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Turnbull: Under amendments to Ontario's Municipal Act that came into effect in December 1990, municipalities throughout the province are legally required to ensure that disabled persons have equal access to all polling stations for the municipal elections, which are on 12 November 1991.

This is a very expensive requirement. North York decided it could not afford the estimated \$1.24 million to build permanent ramps. Instead, the city will reduce the number of polling stations. This will mean many voters will have to travel longer distances to vote, which could reduce the number of people voting in the municipal elections.

The city of Toronto is projecting that the construction of permanent ramps at polling stations will cost in the

neighbourhood of \$37.6 million. Temporary ramps will cost about \$1.3 million.

When the Premier spoke at the opening of a county region's annual conference in mid-October, he said, "We want to make sure that governments that are responsible for the policy take the responsibility for paying for it."

The people in my riding are already paying too much property tax. I challenge the Premier to live up to his own words. He said he would pay for the cost of provincial initiatives. Will his government pick up the cost of municipalities meeting their obligations under the Municipal Act?

VOLUNTEERS

Mr Ferguson: Will Rogers once said that we cannot all be heroes because someone has to sit on the curb and clap as they go by.

Yesterday in my riding I had the privilege and the pleasure to attend a celebration that paid tribute to the local heroes of Kitchener-Waterloo and surrounding area. Over 30 Kitchener residents who have chosen not to sit on the curb and watch the parade go by were honoured for their voluntary efforts in a variety of organizations.

I pay tribute today to these local heroes, who were recognized by the province of Ontario for their time, energy and commitment freely given in the delivery of a wide range of services to the citizens of their community. Joy and Therow Kramer of the K-W art gallery and the Multicultural Centre, Evie Hill of the Joseph Schneider Haus Museum, George Pepall of the Ontario Student Debating Union and Cathy Milloy of the Waterloo Regional Arts Council were but a few of the individuals recognized for the valuable and unselfish role they fulfil in our community.

Today I am sure my colleagues join with me in saluting these individuals who have made an immense contribution in building a more caring, compassionate and humane community in our corner of Ontario.

1350

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME SYNDROME IMMUNODÉFICIENCE ACQUIS

L'hon Mme Gigantes : Monsieur le Président, je suis heureuse d'annoncer les différentes mesures mises en place par le gouvernement pour faire face au SIDA et répondre aux besoins des personnes atteintes de l'infection par le virus d'immunodéficience humaine.

Comme vous le savez, Monsieur le Président, une personne peut être infectée pendant des années sans qu'aucun signe ou symptôme de la maladie ne se manifeste. Il existe un test qui permet aux personnes se croyant être à risque de savoir si elles sont infectées par le VIH, mais nous croyons que le système utilisé et l'exigence de déclaration obligatoire en Ontario empêchent bon nombre de ces personnes de subir ce test. Elles ont peur de la maladie, elles ont peur d'être victimes de discrimination et elles ont peur que ces renseignements soient divulgués.

I am pleased to announce some measures we are taking to extend our government's response to AIDS and those affected by the human immunodeficiency virus.

As you know, people can be infected for many years without any signs or symptoms of illness. There is a test that will tell those who believe they may be at risk whether or not they are infected with HIV, but we believe that many are not coming forward to be tested because of Ontario's testing system and reporting requirements. They fear the disease; they fear discrimination; they fear loss of privacy.

It is extremely important that we encourage those at risk to be tested as soon as possible. With early diagnosis, people can receive the care they need to delay the onset of AIDS. They also receive the information and education they need to prevent the spread of the virus to others.

Therefore, I am announcing two important changes to Ontario's HIV testing and reporting system. We are expanding anonymous HIV testing, making it available in communities outside of Toronto; we are changing the mandatory reporting requirements for the other forms of HIV testing.

There are three types of HIV testing available in Ontario today: nominal testing, the most common, in which the physician requests the test using the individual's name; non-nominal testing, used for approximately 30% of all HIV tests, in which the physician uses a code known only to the patient and the physician when requesting the test; anonymous testing, now available only at Hassle Free Clinic in Toronto, in which the test is requested using a code known only to the patient and no one knows the identity of the person.

With anonymous testing, there is no way to trace the identity of the individual. With both nominal and non-nominal testing, physicians are required by law to report the identity of anyone who tests positive for HIV to the local medical officer of health. The person is then supposed to be counselled on the implications of the illness, and his or her sexual or drug-use contacts are also traced and counselled.

We believe these reporting requirements are preventing many who may be infected from being tested. Statistics gathered by Hassle Free Clinic, which is funded jointly by the Toronto Board of Health and the Ministry of Health, indicate that over the past five years approximately 10% of the people who choose anonymous testing test positive. This is much higher than the 3% rate from other forms of HIV testing. These numbers suggest that people are more likely to come forward when testing is anonymous.

And we are not alone in this view. Ontario's Information and Privacy Commissioner, in a report released last October, recommended that "anonymous testing for the presence of HIV antibody should be available for persons who wish to be tested." The provincial Advisory Committee on AIDS, community groups and health organizations have asked for greater access to anonymous testing as well.

As Minister of Health, my goal is to encourage as many people as possible to come forward for testing and to remove any barriers that may keep them from getting the

help and care they need. Therefore, we will establish and fund anonymous test sites in communities across Ontario.

To ensure that the people of Ontario are aware of their testing choices, the ministry will work with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario to develop guidelines for physicians on explaining the different types of testing and counselling patients on their implications. To ensure that we can continue to monitor the spread of this illness, we will of course require anonymous test sites to collect non-identifying information, such as age, sex and risk factor, from those who come forward for testing.

In addition to expanding anonymous testing, we are also changing the mandatory reporting requirements to make testing more private and confidential. Physicians will now be required to report the name of someone who tests positive to public health authorities only if the physician believes the person may be putting others at risk.

We are committed to moving forward with these changes. We intend to consult Ontario's Advisory Committee on AIDS, public health officials, AIDS advocacy groups and women's and physicians' groups on the best way to implement this more private and confidential approach to HIV testing.

As Minister of Health, I am convinced this policy will balance the right of the individual to privacy with the responsibility to protect public health. By making anonymous testing available throughout the province and by changing mandatory reporting requirements, we will encourage more people to come forward for testing. They will then be able to receive the information and medical and social services they may need and we will come one step closer to stopping the spread of the virus.

Mr Speaker, I believe you and the members will agree that these steps are a basic, commonsense part of an effective AIDS strategy and that they should help us provide better services to those who need them.

RESPONSES

ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME

Mr Phillips: I am pleased to respond and to say there is much in here that we can support. I guess we have one significant question in an area where perhaps there is further debate required. Certainly I think the experience of the Hassle Free Clinic here in Metropolitan Toronto has proven to be worth while, and I believe it is fair to say the previous minister had called for proposals for having similar clinics available to other people in the province. I am pleased to see the minister proceeding with that. I am pleased also to see that statistics will continue to be collected, as she points out here, on an anonymous basis and I think that is a needed aspect of the study.

In terms of considering ways this may be improved, I appreciate the need for anonymous identification of individuals who may have tested positive. The one question I might have, though, on the statement is just whether we should eliminate from this area the medical officers of health.

There is perhaps a middle ground that might be considered, the non-nominal identification of individuals who may have tested positive, just to ensure that the physicians

and the medical officers of health are working together. Certainly some medical officers of health would suggest to all of us that they do not need to know the name of the individual, but what is a benefit to the individual and indeed the community is to have the medical officer of health aware there has been a positive test and in contact with the physician to make certain that physician is doing what is required.

It is possible, under this proposal—and I realize that our physicians are dedicated individuals—but things can fall between cracks. That would be one aspect of the statement I would suggest could require further discussion, the consideration of notifying the medical officers of health on a non-nominal basis that a positive test has taken place, to permit them to follow up with the physician so that we have two organizations working on it.

I guess the final comment I would make is that there are other aspects of this area that need further work, as the minister appreciates, I am sure, and we are looking forward to the more comprehensive plan I think she talked about last week. We are dealing in this area with an extremely sensitive issue that requires all of us to tread softly and with a good deal of thought as we try to ensure that we protect the rights of the individual and the rights of the public. Perhaps this is one of the most challenging areas, to ensure both those things happen.

We support much of what is in here. We would have one, I think, significant comment. I am pleased to see in the statement that it is the minister's intent for further discussion and dialogue on that, but I do appreciate the chance to comment and to be of help in dealing with this particular area.

1400

Mr Eves: I would like first of all to associate myself with the comments made by both the minister and the member for Scarborough-Agincourt this afternoon. I would also like to point out that there are other areas, of course, with respect to this problem that we have in our society today, education being one of them, that certainly need to be addressed so we can get to the root of the problem that we have facing society today.

A couple of other, smaller points. I am not trying to be critical; I am actually trying to be helpful here. A needle exchange program, which I suggested to the minister's predecessor many months ago, a year and a half or two years ago, I think would go a long way to solving a small part of the problem that we have in society today. I know the minister is aware of the northern health travel grant aspect of this problem, because I am aware that it was brought to her attention with respect to a particular individual back in late March, I believe.

She indicated that she would be looking into perhaps expanding that program, to looking after patients with AIDS who need treatment in a lot of those areas of the province where there really are not general practitioners who are used to dealing with this particular disease. These people have to come to Toronto in many instances and cannot afford to pay their way. I would appreciate it if the minister would look into addressing that small part, albeit

n important part to those particular individuals concerned, of this problem as well.

There is one other thing that I would ask of the minister. I am sure she has already thought of it; in fact, she alludes to it on page 2 of her statement. She is putting a fairly heavy onus of responsibility upon physicians by saying that only if the physician believes the person may be putting others at risk will he or she be reported. I do not disagree with the statement the minister has made except that I am sure she is working—I hope she is working—with the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario to be able to address that problem. I am sure there are some physicians out there who are going to be quite concerned about the liability they are perhaps placing themselves in, equal liability as physicians for having to make that judgement. I am sure they could use all the assistance and guidance that is available through the college and through her ministry to assist them in their endeavours.

Mr Cousens: In the last couple of days, the Minister of the Environment has been making statements outside the Legislature and not here. I would have expected that today we would have a statement on the shipment of garbage to Ottawa from Kingston—

The Speaker: Would the member for Markham take his seat, please. We were at the part on the agenda that called for responses to statements made, not the opportunity to make statements yourself, but it was quite interesting.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before continuing, members may wish to welcome to our midst today the former member for Brantford, Phil Gillies, seated in the gallery.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr Nixon: I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Health, who has been so effusive in her accolades to those members in support of the government who have negotiated an agreement with the Ontario Medical Association. I was rather surprised she was as specific as she was in saying what an excellent agreement it was, since I understand that the doctors have not yet accepted it, and she may even have the idea that she can speak to the press about this but not the House.

However, I would like to ask her, under these circumstances, what she can say about the situation involving the medical practitioners since, according to verified news reports, the government is offering binding arbitration, a closed shop and a settlement of between \$200 million and \$300 million. Could she indicate what the OMA in return is offering to the Ministry of Health and, through her, to the people of Ontario by way of a balance in an agreement of this import.

Hon Ms Gigantes: I am going to refer this to the Premier.

Hon Mr Rae: I am delighted to be able to answer. First of all, I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that we have negotiated in good faith as a government over a period of several months. The negotiations have been

difficult and they have been intense, but I believe they have been extremely productive. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that we are not really in a position at this point to go into any of the details of the agreement for the simple reason, as the Leader of the Opposition will well appreciate, that the agreement has to be ratified by the membership of the OMA.

I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that the government regards the achievement of a balanced agreement, one which achieves a system which is well run and well managed in the interests of all the people—as a genuine breakthrough for the province, something which has never been achieved successfully in the past and something which we look forward to with enormous anticipation as a government.

Mr Nixon: The Premier would be aware that such an agreement was reached in the past. I wish I could say that our government had done that because, as the honourable members would know, we had to take the rather difficult position of living up to the requirements of the Canada Health Act and, with the support of the present government party, we banned extra billing. This did not lead to a lot of brotherly love between the profession and the government of the day. But previous to that, the Conservative government did move into an “era of enlightenment” by giving the doctors a full 6% increase, somewhat similar to what it appears the present government is contemplating.

The Premier is shaking his head and will be able to say, when he takes his feet again, that he can give us no details on this, but the indications are that there is compulsory arbitration, a closed shop and a settlement which will cost between \$200 million and \$300 million.

I think it is important, since the Minister of Health has been so elaborate in describing this to the community at large, that the members of the House and the taxpayers know what the cost of this is going to be. Frankly, rather than just moving into an era of enlightenment and friendship between the leader of the government and those members of the medical profession who advertised extensively in support of his contentions previously, we would like to know what the positive aspects are in the agreement involving the OMA.

Hon Mr Rae: The fact of the matter is that the Leader of the Opposition can choose to throw around any figures he wants. I can only tell him that those figures are not an accurate reflection of the overall agreement.

Mr Mahoney: What is?

Hon Mr Rae: Then the member for Mississauga West shouts out, “What is?” He will appreciate, since he knows full well, having learned it at his father’s knee, that it is not possible for me, before an agreement has been shared and ratified with the members. What I can say to the Leader of the Opposition is this: Our determination in going into the negotiations was to achieve a settlement that would be long-lasting, that would establish a clear sense of co-operation between all the partners in the health care system and that would assure the taxpayers of a well-run and well-managed system that would protect the future integrity of medicare as a system for the people of the province.

We believe those objectives have been achieved successfully in the negotiations we have gone into and we believe that it is a remarkable settlement on behalf of all the people of the province. That is why we are so proud of it.

1410

Mr Nixon: It interests me that the Premier has pushed his emphatic button today, mostly because he feels his position is somewhat weak since both he and the Chairman of Management Board and the Minister of Health have spent the weekend saying what an era of enlightenment they are leading the province into.

I would just suggest, since this is an open government and we do represent on this side of the House probably more than 60% of the taxpayers, that he, if not the Minister of Health, should be in a position to indicate just what the provisions are in this. If they are going to talk about how wonderful they are, maybe they should tell us just what the cost of this agreement is.

I do not mean just in dollars, and that is going to be a lot of dollars. In spite of the fact that the doctors have had no indication for two years of an increase in their basic fee schedule, the increases in their payments have been somewhere in the order of 7% a year, to the point that the average payout from the Treasury is about \$225,000 per doctor, according to the numbers that are available from the government.

Frankly, I resent to some extent the fact that the Premier is stonewalling the House and the taxpayers of the province, particularly since the Minister of Health, who should be answering this question, has indicated that she, for example, is going to cut back on community home care programs and a wide variety of other programs so that there will be enough money to move into this era of enlightenment.

I wonder if the Premier can indicate that he has been able to negotiate here, through the Minister of Health and his other minions, an agreement that is going to be of the type that will leave him at least some room for the provision of modern preventive services in the community of the type that so far the Minister of Health has scoffed at and rejected.

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition's characterization of the position of the Minister of Health is absolutely and completely wacko. It has no relationship at all to the direction of the government policy. In fact, it is the opposite of what we are trying to do. I am using "wacko" in its technical sense.

What I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition is this: It is precisely because of our desire to free up funds in the future for community care and for community health that we have determined to negotiate a settlement with the medical profession that will provide for a degree of management of the system.

We found when we took office on 6 September that we had inherited a system which was paid for by the government but effectively managed by no one—not managed effectively by the Ministry of Health, not managed effectively by the medical profession—and it is precisely because

of the need for that effective management that we have reached the settlement that we have.

Let me say that I think it is important for the medical profession to be able to determine its response to this historic, ground-breaking settlement free of political pressure and free of the kind of numbers being thrown around as they are by the Leader of the Opposition, and I am going to continue to take that approach.

Mr Nixon: The Premier may say that I am wacko in this regard, but we left in place for him and his minister a program for long-term care that was well established, well researched and well funded, and this government has stopped it; they have put it on ice. There is still half of the province with no long-term care at all because the minister scorns it and refuses to take action.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment and Garbage Philosophy.

The minister took a stand that was applauded by some in the community that municipal garbage could not go across regional borders. She said the thought of any of this going into northern Ontario was, to use her word, "unthinkable." If the Minister of Transportation had been talking about it, he would have said it was "immoral," something the same.

Yet under the circumstances, we have noticed on the weekend, she has given her interim approval for Kingston garbage to go into Ottawa-Carleton, to a commercial disposal situation there.

I wonder if she can explain the unthinkability of her decision, or the immorality of her approach, in a situation that under her leadership is becoming increasingly confused and inadequate.

Hon Mrs Grier: I am sorry if the Leader of the Opposition is confused, but let me make it very clear to him that my position with respect to the disposal of waste remains exactly what it has always been, that communities have to look after the waste as close as possible to the source of generation and that, in the long term, sites will not be approved that are far away from the source of generation.

The situation with respect to Kingston is very much a short-term solution to a problem that I found waiting for me on 2 October, and let me just share with the Leader of the Opposition some of the details of that situation.

The city of Kingston and its surrounding municipalities take their waste to a dump in Storrington township. That dump reached its approved capacity in December 1988. It was given a contour amendment and an interim expansion from January 1989 to May 1990. It was given an emergency extension from May 1990 to 31 December 1990, and in November I met with the officials from that area and I said that I would give them another emergency extension to 30 April 1990, and that would be the last emergency certificate. In the interim my ministry would work with them to get going on the 3Rs and we would take a look at the environmental assessment application for a long-term site within Storrington that had been filed with my ministry in 1989 and not dealt with.

Mr Nixon: The Ministry of the Environment is approving the shipping of waste from Halton to Buffalo still, is it not?—I ask the member for the area—at a cost of something like \$25 million. The minister is now approving the shipping of garbage from Kingston. How far? One hundred and twenty-five kilometres. According to the new rule which supersedes last week's rule, that is not too far. It is interesting that the honourable minister is making up policy and probably regulations as she goes along, when she said last week clearly that she would not permit the trans-shipment of municipal garbage from one region or community to another and under these circumstances she says, "Well, as long as the distance is not too far." I wonder if she would clarify that rule and indicate, is 150 kilometres the distance that she will permit now, or what are the adjustments going to be in the future?

Hon Mrs Grier: The Leader of the Opposition is once again characterizing something quite differently from what it really is, and he knows that very well. The position of this government is that we get serious on waste reduction and that we require municipalities to plan their waste management systems in such a way that their disposal sites are as close as possible to the source of generation. I have made no bones about the fact that in the short run, in cleaning up the legacy of mismanagement that I have inherited, I would make in each particular situation the most environmentally sound decision that I could make. Faced with a choice of giving a third emergency expansion to a dump that was filled three years ago or allowing that municipality to ship to the closest dump that retains capacity—ie, the Laidlaw disposal site in Carp—I chose to allow Kingston, if it so decides, to take that waste to Carp, and I think that is the best solution that could be reached in this situation.

Mr Nixon: I think the honourable minister means it is the only one she could think of in emergency circumstances. Would the minister not recall that my colleague, the member for Ottawa West, proposed legislation which would give significant control to the regions to prohibit garbage coming into their area? She dismissed that as being unnecessary because of the responsibility that she was taking under those circumstances. Now it appears that it is clearly necessary, since a private agreement involving Laidlaw, Ottawa-Carleton, and their Ottawa-Carleton dump site and the city of Kingston, has not only been approved, but in fact imposed by the minister. Would she not consider that she should be supporting the private legislation from my colleague, the member for Ottawa West, to provide a modicum of preventive care in that instance for the municipalities that are really going to be subject to the rather irresponsible decision she has taken in spite of her own rules?

1420

Hon Mrs Grier: I would be glad to expand on that, because one of the other factors in this particular situation is that both the city of Kingston and the area surrounding it, and the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton have contracted out to Laidlaw Waste Systems the disposal of their waste. Laidlaw, under some other government—and I

do not know which—has a certificate of approval for its site in Carp that allows it to accept waste from all across the province. That situation concerns me and I was very happy that my ministry was able to facilitate the negotiations between the municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and Laidlaw that would allow the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to in fact have some control over the final capacity in that waste disposal site. As part of their negotiations, the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton agreed with Laidlaw that, for not more than two years, waste from the Kingston area could be deposited in that facility, and that was the agreement that was arrived at last week.

Mr Cousens: The question is for the Minister of the Environment. It is obvious that the Minister of the Environment is no longer responsible for waste management in Ontario. Last week this minister was adamant that Metropolitan Toronto's garbage had to be looked after a certain way. York region would look after Metro Toronto's, Durham would look after Durham's. The government had a whole plan, which the minister announced with fanfare and with pride last week.

Last December the minister had in the back of her mind, gave some support to, the suggestion that Kirkland Lake could be considered as an alternative. It was left open as an option after considerable discussions had been held between Metro and Kirkland Lake. It was certainly one of those things that Metro was looking at. Then we come along last week; outside this Legislature this minister has announced, and is allowing to happen, that Kingston's garbage could go to Ottawa-Carleton. Also, we see the same minister making statements outside the House with regard to incineration as to what her position is or is not, but does not bring it back to the Legislature.

What we really need to have is, very simply and straightforwardly from this minister, a statement of the criteria she has for disposing of one's waste. What are the criteria she has?

Hon Mrs Grier: The waste management policies of this government are dependent, first of all, on the 3Rs. The people have to reduce their waste as much as possible, reuse as much of that waste as possible and then, failing that, to recycle their waste as much as possible.

In the announcements I made last February, I laid in place some very specific programs to take us in that direction. I announced the establishment within my ministry of a waste reduction office, which is working with municipalities to do that. It is certainly my expectation that this government will reach, and more than reach, the targets that have been laid down for the reduction of waste. That is our long-term strategy.

Mr Cousens: Those are not the criteria. The minister keeps on coming back, "We support the 3Rs." We all support the 3Rs, it is necessary—but criteria, the way in which you make a decision. The minister comes along and in the greater Toronto area makes a decision: "Okay, we'll send it to York region, put it in Greg Sorbara's riding. Come on. Go and do what you want there." What are the minister's criteria when she comes along and says she is

going to start sending Kingston's garbage to Ottawa-Carleton? What we are really trying to get to is, who is pulling the minister's strings?

Last week, when we asked a question, the minister said in response: "For everyone the member can quote who is unhappy with my decision, I can perhaps quote back to him, from Pollution Probe, from Northwatch, from environmental groups in Kirkland Lake, in New Liskeard, in North Bay and in Timiskaming, that feel the decision this government made yesterday", regarding its Metro garbage, "was the most appropriate decision for the environment. That is what matters." Those were the minister's words.

Now, in response to my colleague the member for Mississauga South, the minister stated: "The member says that this is not an environmentally supportive decision." Let me refer to the release today of Pollution Probe—she was quoting Pollution Probe—which says, "Environment groups have earned a victory with yesterday's announcement by Environment minister Ruth Grier."

I understand what 3 April brought, and so now today I am interested in the minister's comment on what her fan club from those agencies she so highly spoke of last week—what do they say about the minister's policy last Friday to start shipping Kingston's garbage by truck or whatever up to Ottawa-Carleton? What does her fan club say about that?

Hon Mrs Grier: I am sorry if the member does not have a fan club. I can understand that he would feel lacking in that, but perhaps he will one day.

This decision that was taken last Friday, or in fact may well be taken by the city of Kingston when it arrives at its own decision, was to agree with the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton that in its negotiations with Laidlaw, the contractor who deals with both Kingston and area municipalities and the regional municipality—that if they could arrive at an agreement with Laidlaw, this government would facilitate the expediency of that agreement and the introduction and passage of legislation that would allow the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to charge a surcharge to those municipalities beyond its borders that we are using to cart dump. That was what happened last Friday, and the regional council at Ottawa-Carleton agreed with the negotiations that had taken place.

Mr Cousens: The garbage is piling up faster coming out of the Minister of the Environment than it is from Metro and Kingston combined. The fact is, she cannot come along and have one set of rules for Kingston and another set for Metro Toronto. It just does not wash, it does not make sense. I do not know where the minister is coming from.

When you start hearing what Paul Christie in Toronto says, a very enlightened person, he says, "bizarre and unbelievable." Let me add my word; I would say incredibly hypocritical to come along and have that kind of decision made for Toronto which says no to Kirkland Lake and then now in Kingston the minister says yes to Ottawa.

How can she in all good conscience justify her grandiose statement last week in the House saying that the GTA has to look after its own garbage and turn around and tell

the opposite to Ottawa, outside the House? Why did not she at least make the intentions of what she is going to do in the ministry here in this place first?

Hon Mrs Grier: The member seems to have misunderstood what is in fact happening in Kingston and surrounding areas. Those areas have applied under the Environmental Assessment Act for a long-term disposal site for the residue of their waste within their own boundaries. That application has been before my ministry since 1989 and has not been dealt with. It is now going to be dealt with. I hope very much that hearings can start later this year and so those municipalities will have, as will the municipalities within the greater Toronto area, a long-term disposal site within their own jurisdiction.

In the meantime, we have to deal with the crisis that has been allowed to build and which starts on 30 April. The decision that has been taken is, in my opinion, the most environmentally sound decision for the next two years to deal with that particular crisis.

WAGE PROTECTION

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. Last week the Minister of Labour made the announcement on the wage protection fund to much fanfare, and it did not create one job. It was another new tax, I might add, too. The question that the business community has been asking, since the announcement has been made, is whether or not this new wage protection fund will be funded through some kind of business tax. Suggestions have been coming forward that the payroll tax reduces competitiveness, impairs job creation, hurts economic growth and puts the squeeze on small, medium and large businesses.

Will the Treasurer give the business community today his undertaking that he will not pass on another cost to the business community that it can ill afford and will not make this part of the business tax such as the Liberals did under the health plan?

1430

Hon Mr Laughren: I am somewhat surprised to hear the member for Etobicoke West cast his disparaging remarks about a fund that is designed to protect what working people have every right to have when they lose their jobs. I trust that when the legislation comes before this House, the member for Etobicoke West and his colleagues will be in support of the bill, and I want to reassure him that the funds for that program will be paid for this year out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr Stockwell: I would like to get that answer nailed down a little more. The Treasurer used his words very carefully.

Under the next budget, can the Treasurer guarantee the business community that he will not undermine the competitiveness of Ontario industries and that he will not pass another unneeded cost on to the business community today with another unnecessary business tax. When he announces his budget, whenever the heck that is—it may be in May; it may be in June; I am not sure—will he give me and the business community an undertaking that he will not include in that budget a process whereby the moneys

raised for this job protection fund will come out of the business community payroll tax?

Hon Mr Laughren: Partly because of my years in opposition, I am still in favour of supplementary questions, even when they are repetitive. I want to reassure—

Mr Stockwell: If you don't answer the first question, they are repetitive.

Hon Mr Laughren: I answered it as clearly as it is possible to answer.

I think the member for Etobicoke West would agree, however, that there is a collective responsibility to look after workers who are not able to get wages or severance to which they are legally entitled. For those reasons, I hope the member for Etobicoke West will be in support of this particular legislation.

Finally, I will say again to the member for Etobicoke West that we do intend to fund that program out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr Stockwell: I am very pleased to hear today that the NDP government will not be including in the budget for now—or I assume for ever if that is its policy today—some process where it can raise the money for this already inflated program. It has gone from \$145 million at the stroke of a pen to \$175 million and will probably get close to \$250 million before they are done. I am pleased they have assured the province of Ontario that they will not include this in their budget for this year or next year or at any later date, considering their policies today.

Would the Treasurer not agree, though, that the first priority should be to ensure that we keep existing jobs in Ontario? Would he not agree that it is important that we have job creation, not just processes by which people who lose their jobs can go and access money? I do not think anyone on this side of the House is arguing about that, but the question to come is, where is his job creation priority? Where is his priority to create jobs and will we see in this budget a specific outline for job creation and employment for people who are unemployed today? There is nothing more he can do for the people of Ontario who are on welfare and unemployment rolls than to create jobs. Will we see something in his budget, a specific policy outline, to give these people an opportunity for gainful employment?

Hon Mr Laughren: I am tempted to express my appreciation to the member for Etobicoke West for his abiding concern about severance for workers even when they move from one job to another. However, I am going to resist that temptation. I am also going to resist the temptation to write the upcoming budget here on the floor of the Legislature.

I encourage the member for Etobicoke West to be consistent when he is talking about what we should be doing on this side. One day I hear him telling us that we should not be raising taxes and the next day I hear him saying that we should be funding these kinds of programs out of taxation.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: My question is to the Minister of Financial Institutions regarding the subject of automobile insurance. The government has repeatedly stated that it will be introducing

legislation in June, and as we get closer to June, I am sure the people of Ontario are starting to enjoy some relief, because the government has finally said why it is going to introduce government-run automobile insurance.

On 30 March the Treasurer told the Sudbury Star that the public only wants a government auto insurance system "if the rates can be lower." On 4 April the current minister told the Toronto Sun that his government plan would generate "substantial savings that would be thrown into the consumers' pockets in this province."

In view of the above recent statements, will the minister now confirm to the people of Ontario and to this House that when his bill becomes law, automobile insurance premiums in Ontario will be lower?

Hon Mr Charlton: I thank the member for the opportunity to respond to this question. Our objective in pursuing the question of public auto insurance in Ontario is to try to provide the absolutely best possible insurance coverage to those who drive on the roads and suffer accidents in this province and to do so at the absolutely lowest price that we can achieve.

When all the decisions are made about the package, what it will be made up of, the benefits that will be included in it, when we are ready to introduce legislation, then I will be in a position to answer the member's question about specific premium rates.

Mr Chiarelli: Clearly the minister is contradicting the statements that the Treasurer made and that he previously made to the media. Clearly the minister and this government are not prepared to say that their government plan will lower insurance premiums in Ontario. In fact, based on some of the statements that the minister has made recently, the rates will probably increase for a significant number of people.

In a recent speech, on 4 April, and another one on 10 April, the minister advocated elimination of ratings on age and sex. Mr Justice Osborne's report stated clearly that, "Under such uniform classification of rates, senior citizens will definitely pay more and premiums will definitely increase for young women." I ask the minister to admit that it is very likely many premiums will increase under his government's public insurance scheme, particularly for young women and seniors.

Hon Mr Charlton: The member likes to engage in speculation that is likely to cause serious concern for a number of people in this province. I am not going to join him in engaging in that kind of speculation. The drivers of this province, including all those he mentioned, will judge our proposals based on their reality and not based on the speculations of himself and others in the media over the course of the last few weeks.

TORONTO ISLANDS COMMUNITY

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Minister of Housing. Very recently he appointed Richard Johnston, an ex-NDP member of this Legislature. He was given 60 days to accomplish what three levels of government have not been able to in the last 35 years. He has been asked to resolve the Toronto Islands issue. After reading the minister's terms of reference, it is clear that there is going

to be some government subsidy involved, considering the government's previous position and Richard Johnston's personal opinion. The islanders, as I understand it, will not be paying fair rent, as recommended by the Toronto city council, nor will they be paying fair taxes, as recommended by the Toronto city council.

I ask the minister, how much subsidy will these people on the Toronto Islands be getting and for how long? Why is it that these people need the subsidy, when there are so many out there who are in much greater need?

1440

Hon Mr Cooke: I appreciate the question but the question is based on the premise that a solution has been established and that there are going to be all sorts of subsidies. I have asked Mr Johnston to bring the three parties together, the region and the city and the residents on the island, to try to find that kind of consensus and finally, after 30 years—some would say closer to 100 years—this issue could be put to rest. Many local members, including members in the member's own caucus and previous caucuses, have said that there has to be a solution and that this matter has to be resolved. I agree it has to be and that is Mr Johnston's job.

Mr Stockwell: The minister's party has been very clear on this issue. He is maintaining the island resident community; he is maintaining it without taxes, without rent. They have no right to that property, as ruled by every court they have gone through in this country. What gives these people such special status to receive public park land to live on, at preferred prices? We have the islanders who are in need of financial subsidy: We have doctors, we have lawyers, we have NDP members of Toronto council, we have teachers, school principals, university professors, civil servants, therapists, consultants, psychologists, business people.

Will the minister give this House an undertaking that the island community will pay fair market rent and will pay taxes, as any constituent would pay taxes, on the homes they live in? What makes these people so different from the people who live in Windsor or the poor guy who is getting evicted from his house in Etobicoke or any of the other Ontarians around this province? Why do these people on the island have special status? The minister should tell me that when the report comes forward he will document who lives there, what their incomes are and why they get special status, why they get extra money that so many others need.

Hon Mr Cooke: Perhaps the member should talk to Larry Grossman and see what kind of position his party has traditionally taken on this issue.

When the member was describing the different types of people who live on the island, he was quite correct. There is a wide range of people who live on the island and it truly is a community. This party, when it was in opposition, took the position that this community should remain as a viable community. With that principle in mind, I have asked Mr Johnston to try to find a solution in working with the regional council, as well as the city council and the people on the island.

It is our position that the island community should be maintained. I hope we will be able to work out a compromise and a solution which will be acceptable to everyone in this community and in the tradition of all the MPPs who have represented that area, including Mr Grossman.

WASHROOM FACILITIES

Mr Perruzza: My question is to the Minister of Labour. With the construction season getting under way in Ontario it seems appropriate and necessary for this Legislature to address the issue of sanitary conditions on construction sites.

For many years carpenters, general contractors, cement finishers and others who depend on the construction trade for their livelihood have had to put up with substandard sanitary conditions at their work sites, and as is often the case, these men and women are forced to use less than adequate portable toilets, probable sources of contamination. Worse still is the fact that because these workers are only given 30-minute lunch breaks, it hardly allows them time to leave their work sites to have a proper meal in clean quarters, which means that they eat in less than appealing conditions, with nowhere to wash up.

Mr Scott: What page are you on, please?

Mr Perruzza: These are reasons enough for the government to act quickly in setting standards to promote sanitary work conditions for construction sites. Proper hygiene will decrease the spread of germs that lead to unnecessary sickness that directly influences productivity.

It is now up to the Ministry of Labour to ensure that portable washrooms have both water-flush toilets and hot and cold water basins installed in every construction project. My question is, when will the minister introduce legislation that will require—

Mr Stockwell: This is a speech. Even a curveball doesn't take this long to get into flight.

Mrs Cunningham: This is ridiculous.

The Speaker: Relax. If the Minister of Labour would take his seat for a moment—

Interjections.

The Speaker: A lively group.

I offer two observations: First, that all members in the House are offered the same opportunity to ask questions of ministers; second, it is certainly appreciated if the questions are indeed just that and do not involve a great deal of speech-making.

I think all members may be interested to know, because some seem to have a slightly different version of how much time is utilized for questions and responses, that you will soon be aware of the timing that has elapsed for each and every one of the questions and responses. I have been keeping a little stopwatch on you folks and we will provide the results, then you can judge for yourselves. Okay?

Did the Minister of Labour get the drift of the question?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: No.

Mr Perruzza: It is interesting that the opposition is very interested in the subject matter. My question to the Minister of Labour is, when will he introduce legislation

that will require work sites to install water-flush toilets as well as hot- and cold-water washbasins on all construction projects in order to guarantee that the men and women working in this industry have a clean and safe working environment?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I think the question that my colleague has asked is an important one and certainly of importance to the construction workers across this province. I am pleased to be able to respond positively to this concern.

My ministry has just completed a complete overhaul of the regulations for construction projects under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. In these long overdue regulations, which we have been waiting for since 1984, we have clear regulations that require employers to provide or arrange for toilet and cleanup facilities for workers. Now, for the first time in Ontario, construction workers will have the right to clean, sanitary, private and well-maintained hygiene facilities on the job.

We are now developing the guidelines for the administration of this regulation, including guidelines for cases where it is not possible to provide all of these facilities. I can tell the honourable member that we will file this regulation by the end of this month and we hope to have it in place during this coming summer.

1450

HUNTING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr H. O'Neil: Last week's edition of the Huntsville Forester contained the headline "Tourism Minister Gets an Earful About Algonquin." This meeting took place last week in Huntsville and was attended by the minister, the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay and 30 tourist operators. Can the Minister of Tourism and Recreation provide a brief synopsis of the tenor and content of the meeting and convey to this House what he told attendees about consultation between his ministry and the Ministry of Natural Resources?

Hon Mr North: I thank the member very much for the question. I do appreciate it. As the member is well aware, I did speak to him before I went up there and mentioned that I was going up there. We spoke at length about a number of different issues. I tried to talk to them about what I thought could be some things that could be positive, about aspects of native people working in the park or hunting in the park. I talked to them about a lot of different things.

The people up there, to say the least, were somewhat unhappy with what they figured I was not doing, but by the same token, they were happy that I had enough nerve to come, to face them, to speak to them on the issues and to be very direct. I believe that I had an opportunity to at least get to listen to their concerns. They did put them forth very directly and I appreciated those concerns. I brought those concerns back, I spoke to the Minister of Natural Resources on those concerns and I hope that in the future we will have an opportunity to speak to them again.

Mr H. O'Neil: It is obvious from the minister's own description, the newspaper and the minutes of the meetings, to quote Dan Quayle, that these people are not happy

campers. Will the minister confirm that these statements were made at the 8 April meeting: by himself, "I'm very new and I don't pretend to know a lot about tourism;" by the member for Muskoka-Georgian Bay, responding to why the Minister of Natural Resources was not available to speak to them, "Wildman is waiting until he has something more positive to say;" in response to a tourist operator asking whether the Minister of the Environment should be involved and whether they should press for the environmental assessment, by the minister "Yes, you're in a position to press for an environmental assessment?"

Are these statements true and is the minister going to be an advocate for the tourist operators to assist them in getting an environmental assessment?

Hon Mr North: On the first statement, yes, it is completely true that I said that I do not pretend to know a lot about tourism; that in fact I am very, very new. But that statement is taken out of context. I could just add what I said directly after that, that it was experiences like this that were giving me the experience to learn a lot more about the tourism industry and to be an advocate for the tourism industry.

I am the first to admit that I do not think that you can walk into any situation and say that you are the be-all and end-all of the issue and that you could be the fellow or the person who can tell them what they should do about their industry. I am willing to work with the industry. I am willing to try and help the industry to the best of my ability. As far as the statements go, anyone can write anything they want in a newspaper piece.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mr J. Wilson: My question is also to the minister who is trying to be the Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

Hon Ms Gigantes: Meanie.

Hon Mr Laughren: Boo.

Mr J. Wilson: Well, the minister has been in office eight months. He should know something about tourism at this point.

This past weekend I had the pleasure of meeting with tourism operators and small business people in Fort Frances in the riding of Rainy River. I saw at first hand the devastating effects that cross-border shopping or, as they call it in Fort Frances, out-shopping is having on that community and many other communities along the border.

My question to the minister is, what specific advice, in his capacity as Minister of Tourism and Recreation, has he given to the Treasurer of Ontario in order to stop this economic haemorrhaging?

Hon Mr North: I would be pleased to answer the question. As a matter of fact, the member will be happy to know that Tourism Ontario has had a chance in the past week to speak directly to the Treasurer of Ontario and we had a very interesting conversation. Some things were done and some things will be done.

Mr J. Wilson: In a submission before the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, a consultant who was hired by some of the border communities, including Fort Frances, a fellow by the name of John Winter, told

committee members that Ontario can expect to lose \$1 billion in retail business and thousands of jobs because of cross-border shopping.

He went on to add that in the case of Fort Frances the cost of doing business is significantly higher than their competitors across the border in International Falls in the United States. This is due mainly to the fact that retail rents in Fort Frances are 50% higher than across the border. Business taxes and municipal taxes are five times greater in Fort Frances. High gasoline, liquor and resort taxes and high labour rates are all contributing to this devastating problem.

Mr Winter, who is a consultant, said that it is time to stop consulting, which is rather ironic. I do not think we have ever had a consultant appear before a committee and tell us to stop paying them to consult and get some action now. I want to know specifically what the minister is doing, what advice he is giving to the Ontario Treasurer to stop this economic devastation. The tourism industry and small business people cannot afford to wait while this government spends weeks and months consulting. We want action now.

Hon Mr North: As I said previously, I do not know what greater opportunity any group of individuals could have than to come before the Treasurer of Ontario and present its case. I do not know what the member expects someone to do that could be better for the industry than that. They had the opportunity to speak to the Treasurer and I am positive that they gave indications as to what they believed were the problems in the industry. The Treasurer was available, took the time to listen to what they had to say and will take it under consideration. I thank the member very much for his interest.

HYDRO PROJECTS

Mrs Mathysen: I have a question for the Minister of Energy. Late last month, Dr David Suzuki presented issues of concern about the environmental impact of Hydro-Québec's James Bay II project. Does Ontario Hydro also have proposed hydro projects in the James Bay basin?

Hon Ms Carter: I thank the member for that question. I know there is a profound concern about the projected James Bay II development. Both Ontario Hydro and the government realize the importance of environmental protection. That is why Ontario Hydro put forward a project that consisted largely of redevelopment of existing sites that have been used for hydroelectricity already. This is also why the government is subjecting this proposal to an environmental assessment that is among the most rigorous on the continent. The environment continues to be a top priority for the Ministry of Energy.

Mrs Mathysen: Will the concerns of environmentalists and native people be taken into account as this program is reviewed?

Hon Ms Carter: I am proud to say that a total of \$21 million has been made available to the groups that are intervening in the demand-supply plan for environmental assessment. The lion's share of that money is going to native groups and to environmental groups, and I look

forward to seeing their input into the full review of Ontario Hydro's proposals.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs Fawcett: On the weekend, a woman died in Mississauga as a result of a domestic dispute. In the past 18 months five deaths have occurred in Keswick in Georgina township, all attributed to wife assault. My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Considering the urgency of this matter and her government's commitment to combat violence against women, why has the minister not honoured the former government's commitment to expand shelters for abused women?

Hon Ms Akande: As a matter of fact, we have done our own study of the requirements and the needs for shelters. We have had ongoing input from various groups. We have extended. We do have 98 new beds, 11 new houses, and there has been considerable extension. We will continue to make that extension from now on.

1500

Mrs Fawcett: Words are not really going to help these victims of violence. There are some additional facts I would like to make the minister aware of. A Globe and Mail article dated 23 March noted that in Georgina alone they receive 10 complaints of domestic violence per 1,000 citizens, while the average for the region of York is 3.2. The staff at Martha House in Hamilton are fully employed, college-educated professionals who now qualify for the supports to employment program because the shelter has not received any provincial funding. They currently earn \$9 an hour and most have not had a raise in over two years. My seatmate here beside me, the member for Kenora, tells me that at the Kenora Family Resource Centre the government's delay is jeopardizing capital funding from the federal CMHC program. Their deadline is mid-April. In Strathroy, rural women who are victims of abuse are forced to travel to Goderich or London for service.

The shelters' needs are urgent and they are waiting for funds already announced and in existing government allocations. Why was she able to find funds for the London Battered Women's Advocacy Clinic in London, where the Minister of Education used to be the former executive director, and continues to ignore the legitimate needs of the shelters in Keswick, Hamilton, Kenora and Strathroy?

Hon Ms Akande: Actually, this continues to be a concern of ours and in fact the member is quite right. The workers have been underfunded for the past two years and even before that, long before this government came into power. The other thing is that we have met with the Georgina centre—

Interjections.

The Speaker: If the minister—are you completed? If you would direct your remarks to the Chair, perhaps they will be listening.

Hon Ms Akande: We have just recently met with the people from the Georgina centre and to that end have passed some funding to them, and recently, within the last couple of weeks, we have also just funded the Faye Peterson Transition Centre. There are several centres which

continue to be funded, and I would suggest that yes, in London too there is wife assault, in London, in Kenora, in the Georgina centre, and it is the focus of this government and certainly of this minister to address myself to the needs wherever they occur.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Villeneuve: To the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Two weeks ago he told us in this House that he was looking at the implications involved in the closure of the soybean crushing plant here in Toronto. This crushing plant handled about a third of the soybeans grown in Ontario. Last week his government announced a \$175-million project to protect people who lost their jobs, and yet we have soybean growers who are ready to put in a crop, not knowing where the product will be processed. The minister has been consulting with farmers and with the industry. What is he going to do to assist farmers in having their soybean crop crushed this year?

Hon Mr Buchanan: We have talked with the industry. The plant owners who are closing down also have facilities in Hamilton. They are discussing the possibility of expansion of the plant in Hamilton to be able to crush the crop that will come off this coming year.

I would agree with the member, or maybe I can get ahead of his supplementary, that there may be a storage problem in the province. It is the storage problem that I believe we need to address most urgently, and we have had some discussions with some other producers and people who have capacity for storage. We will try to address that concern, because I think that may even be more of a concern in intent in the member's question and he did not get a chance to ask it at this particular time.

Mr Villeneuve: The 25,000 soybean growers we have in Ontario are very concerned, particularly those who are in eastern Ontario primarily. It means a lot more trucking when you have got to cross the city of Toronto, you are going to be deadheading a lot and the expense of hauling will be considerably more. Can the minister tell us that he is going to be taking positive steps oriented towards facilitating the crushing of this year's crop.

Hon Mr Buchanan: Yes, we have had and continue to have discussions with the growers and we will talk to the crushers to make sure. I would like to assure the member that we will also try and address the equalization in terms of extra transportation costs that will be faced by farmers in eastern Ontario. I am most concerned about the unequalization of opportunity if we do not address those needs in eastern Ontario.

The Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mrs Haslam: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: This is the third day in a row of this session that the third questioner on the government side, who is usually a backbencher, has not had an opportunity to ask a question. I am the third one this time. My privilege has been breached.

They take time to do a background. They take time to read questions. They take time to read Hansard. They take time to read letters. They take time to bring on

some information. Then they take time to harangue the government and then they get a question.

My privilege has been breached because I do not have an opportunity today to ask a question. It is the third day in a row that the government backbenchers have not had an opportunity to ask a question.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I appreciate the point raised by the member for Perth. The subject of question period is one that is always of intense interest, and no doubt—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I would appreciate the opportunity to address the members, and I will wait.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Every member in this chamber has the right to raise a point of order or a point of privilege. The Speaker has a responsibility to listen to that, and I intend to do so. I also intend to make sure that every member has that opportunity to place her or his point of privilege or order.

The question of question period itself is one that is of concern to me. It is, however, the question period belonging to the members, and the members collectively have to determine the flow and format that question period will take.

I have, as I mentioned earlier on, prepared some material, which I will be able to share shortly with the three whips, and when you have seen the material then you yourself can decide what course question period will follow.

I thank you for raising the point of order.

Mr Elston: On the point of order, Mr Speaker, I think the member for Scarborough-Agincourt certainly gave you a means by which you could cut down the answers of the ministers last Thursday when he addressed this House. The standard replies seem to be in vogue these days. In fact, uncommon as it may be, this is the first time I have seen a minister of the crown refer the matters of questions back to the Premier. I think if we had some shortened answers on the part of the ministers of the crown, the member for Perth might very well get her question on.

Otherwise, she might very well consider that she should perhaps get her question ranked one or two on the opposition benches. We likewise have problems getting our questions on. There is no question about that at all; we all would like to be on for question period, but it does take time and the standard answers proposed by the member for Scarborough-Agincourt certainly would go a long way to increasing the number of questions that would be allowed on the question period schedule.

1510

MOTIONS

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Hon Miss Martel: I move that the following substitutions be made to the membership of the committees of the House: select committee on Ontario in Confederation, Mrs Mathysen for Ms Churley; special committee on the parliamentary precinct, Mr Sutherland for Mrs Mathysen;

standing committee on estimates, Mr Ferguson for Mr Hansen, Mr Johnson for Ms M. Ward; standing committee on legislative assembly, Mr Jamison for Ms S. Murdock; standing committee on the ombudsman, Mr Kormos for Mr Duignan, Ms M. Ward for Mr Huget, Mr G. Wilson for Mrs Mathysen; standing committee on public accounts, Ms Haeck for Mr Charlton; standing committee on regulations and private bills, Mr Hansen for Mr Johnson; standing committee on resources development, Mr Kormos for Mr Charlton and Ms M. Murdock for Ms Churley.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Ms S. Murdock: I am speaking on behalf of the constituents of Nickel Belt who are asking that:

"Whereas a proposal has been made by Schroeder Engineering to ship garbage to the vicinity of Sultan, Ontario, for landfilling; and

"Whereas the people of Sultan are dedicated to conserving the natural landscape and wildlife of their area and not polluting it;

"We the undersigned...call upon the Ministry of the Environment to reject this proposal and any others which would see garbage from southern Ontario shipped to Sultan or any other rural northern areas."

I hereto affix my name and ask that it be submitted.

NURSING HOMES

Mr Brown: I have a petition to the Lieutenant Governor and the assembly of Ontario. This petition is from residents of the Gore Bay nursing home and it concerns the inadequate funding of nursing homes in this province.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Miss Martel moved resolution 16:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or special order of the House, in relation to Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986, one sessional day shall be allotted to further consideration of the bill in the committee of the whole House. All amendments proposed to be moved to the bill shall be filed with the Clerk of the assembly by 4 pm on the sessional day on which the bill is considered in the committee of the whole House following the passage of this motion. Any divisions required during clause-by-clause consideration of the bill in the committee of the whole House shall be deferred until following 5:45 pm on this sessional day. At 5:45 pm on this sessional day, those amendments which have not yet been moved shall be deemed to have been moved and the Chair of the committee of the whole House shall interrupt the proceedings and shall, without further debate or amendment, put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and any amendments thereto and report the bill to the House. Any divisions required shall be deferred until all remaining questions have been put, the members called in once and all deferred divisions taken in succession.

That upon receiving the report of the committee of the whole House, the Speaker shall put the question for adoption of the report forthwith, which question shall be decided without debate or amendment. No deferral of any required divisions shall be permitted.

That one further sessional day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the bill. At 5:45 pm on such day, the Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings and shall put every question necessary to dispose of this stage of the bill without further debate or amendment. No deferral of any required division shall be permitted.

That in the case of any division relating to any proceedings on the bill, the division bell shall be limited to five minutes.

Hon Miss Martel: I will be brief in making my remarks. I placed most of them last week in terms of the points of order that were raised. However, I would like to reiterate some of the points that I made during that particular debate as to the reason why the government has moved this particular government notice of motion that I am carrying today.

With respect to this particular motion, I think it begs the question again as to pointing out the length of time that we have spent on debate on this particular question, that is, Bill 4, how much time has been spent on it at this point in time, which we feel has sufficiently allowed the minority to express their concerns raised on behalf of their constituents as well.

First, in terms of the time spent on it to date, we have had well over 100 hours in the standing committee that during the break dealt with this particular bill. Members of the House who sat on the committee will recall that public hearings were held, that many days were spent listening to delegations, taking into account what they had to say, travelling about the province, and indeed deliberations on the committee when it returned to Toronto to continue with the clause-by-clause stage.

Up to mid-February, about 25 February, we had at that point some 96.5 hours in that standing committee. There were still three more days to go, and I expect that on each of those days somewhere in the order of six to eight hours were spent, so at the end of the day, well over eight hours spent.

Two days were spent in reporting this particular bill back to this Assembly. Most members of this Assembly who have been here before will recall that a notice in that respect bringing a bill back to this House, or reporting a bill back, would normally not take that long. However, the first two days that this session came back we spent two full days on that, and that was fine. The opposition had ample time again to relate its concerns with respect to the bill, with respect to the hearings, with respect to the legislation before us, with respect to retroactivity, etc. The government allowed a great deal of time for that to occur, and we feel we allowed ample opportunity for the government to come back and relate its concerns at that time with respect to how the hearings had gone and what people had heard.

We then went on to have four days in committee of the whole on this particular bill. I would remind members in this House that that is at least two more days than any

piece of legislation dealt with in the last session of this Parliament, and I would remind members that many of those bills were also controversial. They included, for example, the Sunday shopping bill, the health and safety bill, the workers' compensation bill, which I was very familiar with, and finally, the Employer Health Tax Act, Bill 47. But in all of those cases, the committee of the whole debate that took place did so within two days and was completed. We have allowed for four days. There was no end in sight at the end of the four days. It became very apparent to me that there was no idea, no desire on the part of the opposition to progress, which is fine, but that at the end of the day we would also have to do something about that because it could not continue indefinitely. We have a piece of legislation this government has put forward which this government supports and we would like to get on with the business.

We have proposed in this particular notice of motion one more day's debate in committee of the whole and we have proposed as well one further day for third reading. We think that at the end of the day, given the amount of time spent in committee, the amount of time spent in reporting the bill back, the amount of time spent in committee of the whole before we move this particular motion, plus the two more days of debate we have outlined, will be more than ample opportunity for the opposition to state its case again, for those members who participated on the committee to state their case again and to make their views known. I think we have more than amply provided for that.

I would like to make a couple of other points. This is with respect to the clause-by-clause. Members of the House will know I said last week that one of the reasons this particular government notice of motion should be allowed was simply the fact that the clause-by-clause itself had also been completed during the break when the committee was in deliberations. All of the amendments that were placed by both the opposition parties and, I might add, by ourselves were fully canvassed. Members were allowed to put their cases forward. They did that. Votes were taken, and we finished the entire clause-by-clause process in committee before the bill was even reported back here.

In looking at the amendments that were placed last week in committee of the whole, I noted the Liberal amendments that were coming back to this House were the very same amendments that had been placed, debated and voted on in committee. Of the Tory amendments that were going to be placed in the House during committee of the whole, five of those seven amendments were repeats and again, all those five were very fully canvassed, reviewed, debated and voted upon in committee during the break.

It was my sense, because we did not get very far at all during the committee of the whole in this House, that at the end of the day the opposition was not particularly interested in proceeding any further and it seemed to me that all of the amendments had been placed, they had been debated, and any new amendments that were coming to the floor might well only be for the purpose of stalling the debate even further.

I also want to point out that the government has accepted two of the amendments that were put forward by the Liberal Party. We believe the amendments that were placed were important. They were important enough that we would consider supporting them. We thanked the member for Eglinton who moved them, but at the end of the day the other amendments that were placed are ones we cannot accept. We believe, as the government, that the amendments that have been placed over and above that would, at the end of the day, gut the principles of the bill and we would not be able to proceed. We are not willing to do that as a government. The bill is important. It is important in the sense that it will protect tenants of this province who have not had the kind of protection they require under the rent review system that has been in place in this province, and we intend that we should move on the rest of them in order to put that protection in place.

Third, I point out again to members of the House that this is a temporary bill. It is an interim measure. All members of this House who were here before remember very clearly that our party in particular raised again and again those cases where tenants were suffering all kinds of outlandish and outrageous increases in their rent, to the point where many of them were forced to leave on their own because they could not continue to pay the rents in those particular establishments. I think there was the general agreement of members who were here before that the rent review system that has been in place in this province is not working. It is not working either for tenants or for landlords in this particular province.

We have moved Bill 4 because we believe tenants need temporary relief. During the interim we can work on a permanent bill that we hope will fix the problems we have seen in this Legislature, certainly during the last government when this bill went through. It is our belief that the sooner we can get the temporary legislation into place, the sooner we can bring into this House a new rent review system on which we will allow for a debate again and for people to come and have their say, which is appropriate, and we can get on with the business of putting into place a permanent system that will benefit both tenants and landlords in this province.

1520

I also raise the point about whether or not an end was in sight. I look back again to some of the discussions that have gone on and I can tell you quite frankly, Mr Speaker, and the other House leaders agree, that there is no room for consensus. We have not been able to find a consensus in terms of how long it would take to deal with this bill in committee of the whole House. That is the reason I move this particular government notice of motion, in order to have some end to that particular process. Now that the motion is in place and we are going to start debate on that, I hope we can come to some consensus with respect to how long we will deal with this motion. I have put that question to my counterparts and hope to hear back from them on how we can reach a compromise with respect to debating this particular motion, then moving into committee of the whole and into third reading of this particular bill.

A number of comments will be made, I am sure, and I would do it as well if I were sitting in opposition, about how this infringes on the rights of the minority, about how the opposition members have not had their day in court, have not had enough debate to allow their viewpoints and the viewpoints of their constituents to be heard. I go back and reiterate the kind of time we permitted the opposition parties to state their cases on this particular bill. We did not have a limited second reading debate. It went on for almost nine hours during the course of the last session of this Parliament. People were very eloquent in making their cases and raising their concerns either via letter or telephone conversations they had had with people who were concerned about the bill.

Second, the clause-by-clause debate in committee itself was not limited. There were no restrictions placed by this government on how long that process could occur or when that bill had to come back. Full debate went on, the views were canvassed and people got to the end of their business in the committee when the committee sat during the break.

Mr Speaker, we again had two days' debate in the House reporting that bill back which, I would point out to you, is far in excess of what we usually have in reporting a bill back. That went on, and again the opposition was very free to express all of its concerns with respect to Bill 4, four days in committee of the whole, where we again started a repeat performance of what had gone on in committee, but allowed all of those members who wanted to have a say about this important bill to have their say.

We believe at this point the minority, the opposition, has had its say and has expressed its concerns on behalf of the constituents it represents, but it seems to me at the end of the day this government also has to get on with its business when it believes there is no consensus that can possibly be reached on how to deal with the matter at hand and get it done. That is the reason I move this government notice on behalf of the government. I believe that at the end of the day the government has to do what it has to do with respect to bringing forward the legislation in this Parliament and getting it through.

I believe the bill is very important. I outlined earlier that there is no one in this House who would think the present rent review system works. That is the reason we have put in Bill 4, so that we will have a moratorium and we will then in turn move to a more permanent system which we believe will protect tenants and landlords, will make for a workable system that is not in place now in the province of Ontario. I believe we should get on to that particular piece of business.

Mr Nixon: I regret very much that this early in the life of the New Democratic government we are debating closure, an allocation of time that was so strenuously objected to specifically and in principle by the spokespersons for the New Democratic Party for the years it was in opposition.

We know around here there is a little joke about the phrase "That was then; now is now." Sometimes it has application, but in this instance the matter was held as a matter of high principle by the New Democratic Party. I regret very much that those principles have fallen away so rapidly.

You, Mr Speaker, will be called upon to judge at the end of this debate whether or not the rights of the minority have been in any way infringed upon by the possible passage of the resolution. You are aware that even though a majority of the House might vote for it, at least before that vote is taken you can indicate that in your considered view, and compared with the precedents in this House, the minority requirements have not been adequately met. I suggest to you in this instance that that is a judgement that would be made.

I have listened to the litany of the statistics associated with the Bill 4 that the honourable House leader of the government has brought forward. She will recall that the debate on second reading was not unduly lengthy, particularly since little or no other legislation was before the House at the time, that the hearings held by the standing committee might have been long in the judgement of the minister. But you are also aware, Mr Speaker, that at least 100 groups which had applied to put forward their objection, or perhaps in some cases their support of the bill, were not granted that right because of the government's insistence that the committee move forward rapidly and report. We are aware that in the minds of the minister, this is all very orderly, that in fact this is interim legislation until we go on to what he perhaps might call the final solution.

Because we do not seem to understand the orderliness of the minister's proposal, his natural arrogance, his impatience and his autocratic approach to public service come forward in a way that does not become him or the government. I understand he is not taking part in this debate and I think he is very wise not to be present at all. He was not here when the resolution was introduced. This is the responsibility of the House leader. It is difficult for us to tell on whose initiative this resolution was entered into, but my own view is that the Minister of Housing, together with some of his political buddies in the NDP, has decided it is time for the socialist majority in Ontario to impose its will.

It certainly does not become those who wrote the book on obstructionism in this House. You will recall, Mr Speaker, over the last numbers of years, the NDP has pushed to the limit every possible rule that would stop legislation in its proper course of debate being democratically decided in this House. You will recall the debates went on for 24 hours on more than one occasion. On one occasion that certainly I will not forget, the obstructionism of the NDP meant that the Treasurer of the day—it happened to be myself—was forbidden to read the budget of the province to this House. Because of their position on those matters, I was forced simply to table the budget and let it go at that.

Frankly, it was a crime against the democratic process. The only thing I could say is that people do not seem to worry about those things. It really means that members on the opposition side should not hesitate for a moment to undertake as extensive a debate as they feel is appropriate in order to put the alternative view in this House and to the people of the province.

I frankly regret that the NDP has brought this forward, and I resent it because I have been present in this House

while it undertook the kinds of antics that actually brought this House to a standstill, not for four days—that is the extent of the debate in this House during this particular committee hearing—but for weeks and months at a time. Who knows what ramification that obstructionism had to the welfare of the province and the evolution of appropriate and moderate political development. I believe it has had a deleterious and damaging effect on the processes here in this House and the welfare and the benefit of the province as a whole.

I feel very strongly about it. I understand the Progressive Conservative Party, in its previous incarnation as a government, and ourselves as Liberals, brought forward time allocation and moved the closure of the debate. Governments always have to make these decisions sooner or later. The sort of philosophical and intellectual virginity of the New Democratic Party that it has so successfully preserved over these many years in opposition must even give it a twinge as it throws that precious philosophical superiority to the winds, under these circumstances, after only four days of debate, and that is after question period which is often after 3 o'clock until 6 o'clock when we normally adjourn here. To say this is unconscionable prolongation of the debate is bad judgement indeed.

I want to thank you also, Mr Speaker, for taking the points of order raised by myself and the House leader of the Progressive Conservative Party when this resolution was put to the House first last week, on Wednesday. The House leader had gone to the very limits of reducing notice for the motion, putting it in at 5 o'clock in the afternoon previous to the day on which it was to be debated. It did not appear on the order paper until that following day and most of us only had one or two hours' notice that it was going to be presented. You ruled, Mr Speaker, that under our rules it was appropriate to do so. Before doing so, however, you took a day's notice to consider it. So whatever the upshot and whatever the validity of the rules as they presently are, which you made clear, at least we had an opportunity to look at the precedence and to marshal our arguments for this important debate.

1530

I understand that the majority will eventually out on this. I have already pointed out to you, Mr Speaker, that it is quite possible for you to indicate that the motion is premature, and that based on the precedence in this House where closure has been used back through the years under a variety of circumstances, I do not recall a situation when debate, just having been four days in the committee system, would elicit a motion of time allocation, possibly put to the vote by a motion of closure under these circumstances.

The responsibility lies with you and your advisers in that regard to a great measure. How much is enough? How much is too much? To decide that there is too much debate going on in this House in my view simply means that the person who makes that decision does not understand what we are here for.

I suppose obstruction occurs. Certainly, I have indicated that in my view it was the benchmark, the only parliamentary process that the NDP in opposition understood and used repeatedly. It did not matter what the bill was. It

did not matter how outrageous the position was. Obstruction was the order of the day, pushing the government of the day—and it was Liberal at the time—so that its legislative program could not proceed.

We always had bills which were properly printed and available for the opposition caucuses to review well in advance of the debate. Since the New Democratic Party has taken over the power of government, that is not the case. Bill 4 is an important bill even though it is just an interim one, as the honourable House leader has indicated, and we are waiting for something in the future where the Minister of Housing, with his imperious approach to policy, will indicate how the democratic socialists are going to proceed to bring in this kind of socialist nirvana to the province of Ontario.

Little else is before us. We had an important announcement from the Minister of Labour a few days ago, but it is not possible for us to debate that until the bill is printed and reviewed by the various caucuses and we go forward. There are many routine bills—important bills, but hold-over bills from the previous government, that could be debated; that is true. But particularly from the Minister of Health there does not seem to be any push to get on with that particular business. We have to remember that this government has been in office more than six months. I believe this is the fourth week that we have been in session here and still the order paper is relatively bare. So the House leader cannot indicate that there is a huge pressure of business that has somehow been blocked.

This is important legislation involving draconian aspects indeed, having to do with removing the rights of the business people and others in this province to do business in an orderly way and changing the law retroactively, which according to many of them puts them in a position where they cannot continue. This is a matter of great importance to them, and to dismiss it with some sort of political gambit, in my view, is unworthy of the government and an abuse of the rules.

I can recall, actually—and I do not want to remove from the discussion my concern about the resolution that is before us—that we have had these debates before. The government of the day, from time to time, has felt that it simply must proceed when the time indications were such that it had to have the legislation for some appropriate reason.

The occasion that comes to mind is the decision made by the then government of the day, a Progressive Conservative government, to have what amounted to a sort of wage control situation that was once again important and draconian. The House leader's father, who was then House leader for the New Democratic Party, and I were very much opposed to the introduction of a time allocation motion. As a matter of fact, the debate became so acrimonious and heated that both of us were dismissed from the service of the House for the remainder of that sitting day. The members, however, realizing that they had made a mistake and in fact perpetrated a gross injustice, after they came to their senses and the steam evaporated out of their ears a bit, rescinded that motion and we were invited back into the House to take part in the debate under those circumstances. I

hope my memory of that is reasonably precise, but anyway I was allowed back in. But of course I was a good boy.

Under the circumstances, it seems strange and somehow ironic that the honourable House leader would be put into this particularly difficult situation by her colleagues and particularly by the Minister of Housing. His impatience with the democratic process in a strange way was even evident when he was in opposition. It was always clear from our position in government that while the honourable minister did not lack intelligence or ability, he seemed to lack, strangely, an appreciation of the democratic process and what must go on in a Parliament which is designed for the expression of views. These are often violently or strongly opposing views, but still it is a place where these views must be fully expressed before the legislation proceeds.

I am concerned, again, that the list of business that is awaiting review by this House is not such that the House leader should throw up her hands in defeat and say that no amount of reasonable debate is going to move this forward to a conclusion. I do not believe that is right. Certainly there has been no concerted view in the Liberal opposition that we should do so. But I will tell members that I find it naïve in the extreme for cabinet ministers in the New Democratic government to come forward and say, "when we bring in this important legislation we will expect rapid passage, because we have to get on with our important affairs." That sort of attitude is going to lead to a rather difficult situation in this Legislature, where our responsibilities are seen rather differently from the position of the government.

This House is not just a rubber stamp, in spite of the fact that the government is operating with a majority. That majority is based on the votes of only 38% of the electorate, which means that a large proportion of the electorate did not support the government. If the government has some sort of feeling that the people out there want to dismiss the Legislature and its process and somehow leave the arbitrary rule and authority with the Premier and his political minions, I would suggest that is a serious error indeed.

I think there has been a good deal of disillusionment with the New Democratic government since it took office. It is not my intention to spend time now in talking about the basis of that disillusionment, but we hear about it everywhere. Even many constituents in my own area who supported the New Democratic Party have indicated that they felt it was a mistake to do so.

As a matter of fact, I was listening to a spokesperson from Sudbury, probably a good friend of the honourable House leader, who said she became a New Democrat because she heard the revered and sainted Tommy Douglas deliver an allegory which, frankly, I had heard him deliver myself. It talked about a mythical kingdom called Mouse-land where once every four years the mice got a chance to vote for a government, but the only people running were cats, white and black. They had a chance to change the government, but they could only vote for cats, never mice.

This lady, when she was interviewed, struck me in an interesting way. She said, "As much as anything else, this

convinced me to join the CCF," and of course continue her allegiance with the NDP. Perhaps I am misquoting her, but she said: "Now that they're finally in power in the province of Ontario, we realize that the mice could have had a white government or a black government; they've still got a government of cats." She did not say this, but I said, "Yes, I suppose a government of pink cats, but still cats," cats who simply abandon their philosophy as soon as they step into the limos, as soon as they get the government credit card, as soon as they figure that only they know how to proceed with the establishment of policy for the good of the people.

1540

The idea that they would dismiss debate in this Legislature so summarily after only four days of committee review, even though there was extensive review previously, but even that was thought by many sensible people to be inadequate, is, I think, a disappointment to many of the people in this province.

As far as I am concerned, I have been in a position that the honourable House leader has been in, in support of a time allocation. There will be those whom, I hope, the government will give an opportunity to speak after me who will be able to put before you, Mr Speaker, the numbers of hours and minutes and so on. I do not believe there is a situation in precedence in our Parliament where the government of the day so summarily has moved to guillotine debate after it has proceeded only for what amounts to about 12 hours in committee.

If the honourable House leader has to report to her leader and to the minister that she sees no possibility of an end to the debate, I believe she is wrong. I believe she is pessimistic. There are other ways to proceed with a debate and to bring it to a reasonable conclusion after the honourable members have had a chance—on all sides, by the way—to express their views. There has been a remarkable scarcity of New Democrats joining in this debate. The minister has wiggled and fumed and fussed around and no doubt has given the order that he does not want any New Democrats speaking because the policy is established and he has written the policy and the whole thing is to get the opposition parties quiet and lined up.

I think that approach to the democratic process is wrong. I think it flies in the face of reasonableness of any democrat, whether new or old or even middle-aged. I think it is an unreasonable approach that the honourable House leader has been forced to take by pressures above and beyond her in her position as House leader. I do not expect her to be the authority on these matters, but simply to provide her views to cabinet and to whatever committee makes these decisions.

I say to you, Mr Speaker, that they have made a mistake, but the traditional responsibility lies with you. The responsibility is to safeguard the rights of the minority, the rights of the minority even to be boring, God help us, as we sometimes are as our comments go on. We regret that. Not everybody can have the electricity of—I will not name a cabinet minister because they are all kind of electric in their own way. It is not a question that we are here to entertain. It is not a question of always bringing forward

some new point. Reiteration for slow learners is something that any teacher knows is important.

I believe, Mr Speaker, that the responsibility lies with you to indicate that this motion is premature and to allow the debate to continue in an orderly fashion, to recognize that the duty of those of us elected in this House is to put forward in opposition an alternative which may or may not be positive. We try to be positive. In this regard I feel that the motion should not be allowed to proceed, and if it does, it should be struck down.

Mrs Cunningham: I cannot speak with the same degree of experience as the Leader of the Opposition did but I can speak with some experience. I will say that upon being elected to this House just some three years ago, I was invited to attend what I think some members would be very interested in knowing about. It was an organization of parliamentarians referred to as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

There are in fact seminars that are presented from time to time by the Canadian arm of this association. In 1988, upon first coming to this House, some time in the spring later on I was invited to go and represent the province of Ontario as one of the elected representatives, along with David Smith from the Liberal Party and the member for Hamilton Mountain of the New Democratic Party.

It was an experience that I will treasure and one that gave me great insight and understanding around the whole issue that we are dealing with this afternoon. Time allocation in debate was the subject of the discussions. All provinces were represented. It was a wonderful opportunity for us to hear, especially from the Speakers, from members of the Senate, the House of Commons. Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Newfoundland, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Ontario, which I have already represented, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan and the Yukon were all members of this tremendous discussion in Vancouver, British Columbia around how important it was.

Mr Nixon: Vancouver. It's nice there.

Mrs Cunningham: Although we are making fun of some of the travels that members of the Legislative Assembly have in the past experienced as part of their work, this one I felt was very much work, but I also thought it was a tremendous learning experience. What I found is that the province of Ontario probably had the most progressive record on the whole issue of the use of time allocation in their House. In fact I delivered the paper, which I had the opportunity to do on behalf of our province, and we certainly spent a lot of time on it with the Speaker of the House at that time and the clerk. We did a lot of research into just how this allocation of time should be used in legislative assemblies.

We found out, of course, that the government from time to time may find it necessary to take certain steps to ensure the timely passage of legislation that is controversial or of particular importance, and it may become necessary to curtail debate on legislation using this process that we are discussing today.

I thought it was interesting the kind of homework we had to do. In presenting Ontario's case, all three members

that were there agreed to present the case in the light that we felt it was a motion that had not been used very often. In fact, in the province of Ontario this process was used for the first time in 1982 and it was used, of course, by the Conservative government of the day. Bill 179, the Inflation Restraint Act, was the very first time that this particular motion was used. That particular bill was, I believe, debated, and I do not have it right at my fingertips, but it seems to me over 94 hours, just that particular piece of legislation.

At the time, the argument against that time allocation was one that was put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party, the member for York South, and certainly by the Liberal Party's deputy leader, the member for Renfrew North. Their concern, I think at the time, was legitimate and certainly not the concern that we are facing today, in fairness, and that was that the motion was entirely out of order because there were no rules within our own Legislative Assembly for this particular action. Very quickly, I think, over the next few months the Legislative Assembly did put into our standing orders rules that govern this whole allocation of time.

It was most interesting to note the number of hours of debate, and certainly it must have been precedent-setting at the time to even enter into any discussions, because in the end the three House leaders did in fact agree to the time allocation motion and the time frames involved. It was something that was worked out as a necessity and, although it was spoken against by both opposition parties at the time, I think the key was that the House leaders worked out the rules of that particular first example in 1982.

It was not used again for a year, in 1983. This is the second time—and I beg your forgiveness, Mr Speaker—it was the second motion that had some approximately 97 hours spent on consideration of the bill in both the standing committee on general government and in the House before this motion was introduced. The former one that I talked about was almost as long, but this was some 97 hours, 15 February 1983, introduced by the Honourable Bette Stephenson, the then Minister of Education and Minister of Colleges and Universities.

In looking over the debate on that second time, it went on for some considerable days. It was Bill 127 at that time, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act. The time frames again that were negotiated with the three House leaders were agreed to. It is rather fun to read the Hansards around this to see what people say. The argument at that particular point in time was that it was not in order, stating that there was nothing in our standing orders and even less in our practice save and except the fateful day in December 1982 that legitimized this practice. Those words were spoken by the member for Renfrew North at that particular time. The Speaker, of course, again without House rules, ruled it in order and it proceeded but not without considerable time.

1550

The third time allocation motion was in 1984. We are looking at some years, a couple of years, in between here. It was Bill 142, An Act respecting the City of Barrie and

the Township of Vespra. This time the motion was worded as the first motion was in 1982. Again, it went on for some numbers of hours. I believe that one was over 60 hours of debate. We could check that, but in my recollection of doing this research, it was a considerable amount of time, not as much as the second time allocation motion but certainly considerable hours.

It was not until 1986 that the Liberal government introduced its very first time allocation on the consideration of Bill 94. That was the act regulating the amounts that persons may charge for rendering services that are insured services under the Health Insurance Act.

In summary, after looking at that debate, I can only put on the record these words, that it is clear that there are circumstances under which it is necessary for a government to impose a time allocation motion. However, it is also true that by consultation with all parties in the House it is possible, even on the most contentious of issues, to secure voluntary agreement to time limits. That, of course, is what has happened to this time.

On occasion there have even been agreements securing the timely completion of each stage of a bill in the interest of allowing the parliamentary timetable to progress. We have seen from the experience of the Ontario government in 1983 that even after an unsuccessful attempt to impose allocation of time on Bill 127, the government did succeed in securing the completion of the bill within the limited time by consultation with the other parties.

I am simply speaking here to the history of this Legislative Assembly and how governments have worked together after lengthy debate on pieces of legislation to work out the rules around a time allocation procedure.

I would stand to be corrected, but it is my understanding that only once has that not happened before. I believe that was on the Sunday shopping legislation. But even then, I am not certain because nothing has been documented. All we can do is take the word of the members who are presently here in the House as to what did happen at that particular period of time. Perhaps the government House leader can help me out on that one.

On this particular piece of legislation I do not think that the opposition parties would have been so strident in debate if it had not been for the public that came before the committee during public hearings across the province of Ontario. I have not taken the opportunity to speak to this particular piece of legislation in the past, directly in this House, although I have from time to time observed certainly my colleagues and the members of the government and the minister. But this is a piece of legislation that has incurred tremendous opposition, more opposition in numbers than even the Sunday shopping legislation that at that point of time I was very much a part of, and certainly very much more than the public debate on auto insurance as presented by the Liberals.

This one, I believe, is one that should be worked out with the government and with the critics around what is fair for the taxpayers of this province that we represent, whether they be home owners, landlords, tenants, private or public sector, people who are involved in providing

affordable housing in the province of Ontario, and everybody knows we need it.

This piece of legislation is unfair because it is retroactive, a piece of legislation that affects the livelihood of individuals who have invested in their apartment buildings, in their housing units; who most frequently, with the advice and the consent and at the request of tenants, have entered into an agreement to complete certain refurbishings; who have agreed to repair both outside and inside parking lots and kitchens and stairwells, and who depended on each other to be able to get that work done.

In these times it is really difficult to see the lack of leadership on behalf of this government as it takes a look at a process that was not working, the rent review system, which was backed up, where decisions were not made fairly, where in fact perhaps the right numbers of persons to support the system were not there. But it is a system that if they do support it, they should have been putting their energies around fixing it first of all. That would be my first complaint.

Right now, today, this rent review system is in operation. People are still going before the committees; they are still submitting to the rent reviews. No one knows what is happening. This government has said that it would come forth with a housing policy. It is unbelievable that we could be standing here today looking at a piecemeal piece of legislation that is now being subjected to a rule in this Legislative Assembly that is used very seldom, and at the same time a very serious piece of legislation, when one cuts off debate by elected representatives. At the same time, we have got people out there who are waiting to get their parking lots repaired, who are waiting to have their units painted, who are waiting for repairs that have been promised. It seems absolutely insane that a government would bring forth this piece of legislation and at the same time have us looking at a long-term, permanent housing policy. It just does not make sense.

To come before the Legislative Assembly and stop debate on this almost seems as if it is a game, and this game is affecting people's lives. It is not only affecting the people who have to live in these apartments and live in these homes; it is affecting the people who had confidence in this particular government; it is affecting real workers in Ontario who would like to get on with the work; it is affecting investors in our province, not only people who live here, but people who live outside our province. I do not have to tell any member of this Legislative Assembly how often all of us have been approached on both sides of the House by people who say it is just not worth doing business in Ontario any more.

For young people I can only present during this debate this afternoon, I can only say on their behalf that they are losing confidence quickly. Many of them had hopes with this government. This bill is nothing but silly. It does not make any sense at all. Processwise, why would anybody introduce a piece of legislation and go to the public for their input—the majority of the public said: "Why do this now? It is stopping us getting our work done. We cannot get our buildings fixed up." We have a rent review process in place. If someone is charging extraordinary rent, if the

whole physical job of fixing things is too expensive, we have a process in place right now. It is not working. We have other processes in place that are not working: support and custody orders enforcement for one, the Workers' Compensation Board for another. They are not working.

We are not providing the kind of services out there that we should be providing to support families in this community. This bill is taking away even more services: the right for people to get their apartments fixed up, to come to some kind of an agreement with their landlord. Without agreement, they go before a certain board that we are still paying for. Then to have to sit back with all this happening with this piece of legislation and wait for some permanent housing policy of this government just shows that it is a government in its very early years that is sending out a message that it cannot manage.

I think the most important thing I can say today is that they do not listen. We listened to the public talk about the former government, the Liberal government, not listening. I think they took a toll because of it. This government now went around the province during the election talking about everyone else not listening, certainly the Conservative government before them, then the Liberal government, talked about how good it was going to be. We spent all this money on public hearings. I hope people are watching us here this afternoon. They get good advice and nobody is listening and that is what is wrong with government, and this government is no different.

1600

It is going to take a major change in process, in program delivery, to really meet the needs of families out there in Ontario who are looking for affordable housing, who are looking for housing that can be livable. When they go to their landlord and ask him to pave a parking lot and the landlord agrees and they agree with their rent, there has to be some process whereby that work can be done.

We are not just talking today about big apartment owners. We are talking about little people who have made their livelihood by renting rooms in their own homes, by renting units in small apartment buildings and who have been on my doorstep for some three years because the rent review process was not working. This bill is not making it any better; it is making it worse. That is why this retroactivity, the broken promise to people who had already had the rules set out, who understood what had to be done, who had a process to follow, which was not a great one but could have been fixed—are so frustrated and angry about this legislation.

The private sector, which we have to depend on in Ontario because people cannot keep paying taxes to get all this work done—people need jobs to pay taxes to get the work done—is packing up and leaving. In the riding that I represent in London there are many of them that are doing that quietly. This government, they thought, would be different and it is not, because the worst promise it could have broken was not to listen.

I, for one, if this time allocation motion goes through, will also remind this government that we have had the least amount of debate on a bill before this House, both in

committee and in committee of the whole, in this Legislative Assembly, less than in any other previous government. That may not sound like a big deal, since we have probably only had five or six time allocation motions in the history of this Legislative Assembly. By the way, this assembly is looked towards for leadership across Canada so that there can be public debate by public citizens, elected citizens, members of this Legislative Assembly that can in fact present the views of the people they represent. This time allocation order is one that is used only very infrequently, and I will add usually, with one exception, the House leaders have agreed that it should happen after timely and fair debate.

I will close on that note. We have not had timely, fair debate. This New Democrat government, this socialist government which promised to listen, has not listened on this legislation, because if it had, it would have withdrawn the bill, taken a look at the intent of the bill and put it as part of its permanent housing policy, as part of a strategy, as part of a solution to a very real problem. It has not done it and now it is using the last tack that it can in this Legislative Assembly.

I have no idea what the response to this will be, but I do know there will be some very long memories on this one and I wish them luck as they go around the province looking for good input on their housing paper. They will have to change their process on that as well. When you think that elected people who represent their ridings are not allowed to speak at meetings—this is a government that wanted open government, that was going to listen. Maybe they are learning something, but they had better learn fast, because they are taking the province of Ontario with them. People are not investing, people are becoming less supportive of their policies, of the way they are operating, and most of all, in this Legislative Assembly today we are seeing some firsts: retroactive legislation, number one; House leaders have not agreed that we have had timely debate, number two; and number three, the first time we have ever had a piecemeal piece of legislation that is supposed to be part of a major policy where we are asked to vote on it in this manner.

Mr Speaker, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to this particular motion. I am not happy that I had to rise and do such a thing, especially in the early months of this new government.

Mr Brown: I usually say, "It is a pleasure to rise and speak" to a motion. In this case, it certainly is not. To be standing and speaking about a motion for time allocation, especially on this bill, is repugnant at this point. It seems to me that in order to cut off debate to keep the members of this Legislature from being allowed to speak, there has to be some overwhelming, good reason. Quite frankly, I do not know, and the government has not provided any information on what overwhelming, good reason there is for stifling the debate at this point.

I heard some interesting comments from the government House leader earlier, and being one who was on that committee, I think maybe I should refresh her mind about what actually went on in committee. What went on was that we had five weeks allotted to the committee to discuss

these issues. Of those five weeks, the government saw fit to use some of that time to bring in a green paper on housing. They broke the initial agreement for five weeks and used some of the time to bring in the green paper on rent review. What it did was take some time away from the committee time. It also meant that we did not have enough time to hear the presenters.

We worked as hard as a committee can work on the road. I see some of my friends on the committee from the government side are here and I think they could attest to that fact. We sat evenings when necessary. We sat one week five days of the week. We travelled. We did whatever was possible to do in the three weeks. There were no more groups that could have been heard during those three weeks than this committee accommodated.

Yet more people were not accommodated than were. There were 150 individuals or groups who were not heard on this bill; 150 could not put their views before their legislators, before the people who represent them. There were 150: "But that's okay," the government says. "You've had enough time. That's it. We don't want to hear from you."

We got down into committee to do the clause-by-clause. I do not think any objective observer would call either of the two opposition parties obstructionist during that period. There was no obstruction. The opposition had some important points to make; we made them. We moved through the business of clause-by-clause expeditiously. This would not, at least in my experience, be like, say, Bill 162, which the government House leader would be very aware of, where during clause-by-clause it was very normal to hear long debates over whether a comma was in the right place or if the semicolon was in the right place or if we could redefine "accountant" or some other term in the bill. We had all those very important, obstructionist proceedings on the part of the opposition.

The opposition clearly was not going to let the bill pass. That was their intent, that was what they stated from the outset and from their philosophic point of view, that was fine. But their intention was clear, and the government—at that point I was sitting on its benches—went through that process. We watched them call for 20 minutes every time there was a vote. For those who are unfamiliar with the process, a committee has the ability to ask for a 20-minute recess before every vote so that all members of the committee can be there or so that they can discuss their positions before taking a vote. Every clause required a 20-minute pause.

1610

This was not the case, I say to my dear friends in the New Democratic Party. This is not what happened. If they look back at the record, their caucus took 20 minutes more often than the opposition did to round up its members or to discuss their position or whatever you do during those 20 minutes. I would suggest that the idea that the opposition is being obstructionist here is just not on; it is just not the case. We have our points to make and there are some things we violently disagree with, but there has been no indication so far that we intend to be obstructionist.

No one here has said, "We will not allow this bill to pass because we are going to use every parliamentary device in order to keep it from passing." That was not our position. Clearly, as a Liberal, there is much in this bill to commend it. For example—and I think Ms Harrington, the parliamentary assistant, who is here, will know—we have agreed to the freeze. We think it is genuinely important that a new government take some time to review the old legislation and to improve it as it might. We agree with that. We have not objected to that whatever.

We have objected to some other clauses in the bill, in particular the retroactivity and in particular the capital pass-through during the interim period, and we have also objected because there was not sufficient tenant protection in regard to maintenance and other issues.

At no time have we indicated that the principle of the bill is something we cannot support. In fact, we do support the principle of the bill, but we cannot live with the bill the way it is. A responsible member of the Legislature must bring his point of view to the House. There are only 12 members who sit on this committee, and down in committee we may all know what is going on, but the rest of the members of this Legislature do not. This is an opportunity, in committee of the whole, to let all members understand what the points are about, why particular parties are upset with some particular part of the bill, and this is, I think, a democratic right.

Much has been said before me about previous closures and previous time allocations. I am not going to go into that, but I would say to the government House leader that this is truly unprecedented. It just is something that offends my right as a parliamentarian to put forth my point of view and the rights of members on her side to put their points of view across.

I have heard scarcely a word from the government back bench about this. There were six of them on the committee. They do not have much to say about this. I do not know why they favour putting 3,000 landlords into bankruptcy. I do not know why they want to do it. I have asked that over and over again. I do not know why in a time of recession they insist on putting thousands of workers out of work. We do not know that either. We do not know why they want to do that. I asked this question of the parliamentary assistant last week, I believe. We do not get any real good answers about this. Sincerely, we want to know what it is, why they want to do this. A satisfactory explanation to those points might move this business along, but we have not got it.

In talking about the committee hearings, I think that we also have to understand that we did not canvass Ontario's views very completely. We had difficulty. We could not get the government to agree to send the committee to Thunder Bay, for example. They would not do it, even though a minister of the crown, the Minister of Revenue, an MPP from the Thunder Bay area, requested that the government would do that. But no, we could not go to Thunder Bay. That was not something the government thought we could take time to do. It was not important to go to the north-west; it was not important to hear what northerners in that part of the north had to say. It just was not important.

The government House leader has the nerve to come in here and say: "The committee process worked just hunky-dory because you in the opposition were not obstructionist. You were not obstructionist so it worked well."

It is true: We were not obstructionist. We are here to make this place work. We do not see our role as being obstructionist, but we also think the tradeoff for that is that the government needs to give the bill the time in this House to be carefully considered by all 130 members. There are important amendments to this bill that need to be considered and, quite frankly, given the amount of time that the government House leader has allotted, I do not think they can happen. We are now debating a clause on retroactivity on capital, but there are many more amendments, many amendments we think are pretty important, and in the time the government is going to allow us these will not be debated at any length, and I would be surprised if some of them get debated at all. They will be deemed to pass when the time is up and they will not be discussed.

There are some important amendments, like the Liberal amendment which suggests that capital expenditure no longer be borne, and that means, for those who do not understand that, if a landlord has gone to rent review and got an increase based on spending capital dollars, that increase is rolled back as soon as the capital dollars have been amortized. That is essentially what it means. That is a help to tenants. It makes sense. Why should a cost that has been paid for continue to be passed through? But that clause probably will not receive much debate here.

There are other important amendments. There is an amendment which says essentially that if the quality and value for money of a repair are not proper, that cost should not be passed through. That is important to tenants. It is important that if they are to see their rent increase, or have seen their rent increase they should not have to pay for something they did not really receive. I think that is terribly important.

There is another amendment that talks about maintenance. It says essentially that if a landlord has not provided adequate maintenance to the building, he will not be entitled to rent increases. We think that will help the maintenance in the system. We think that tenants will benefit because no landlord will be able to have an increase if the maintenance was not done.

In other words, I have a whole handful of amendments that will never be discussed in this place. They will not be fully aired before the people of Ontario, they will not be fully aired before the Parliament of Ontario, among the 130 members of this place, and that is, I think, going to be a hallmark of this government.

There is not, on the other hand, as my leader, the member for Brant-Haldimand, has pointed out, pressing government business in the Orders and Notices. What is there to debate? What is the government House leader going to call if we do not debate this? What is so pressing that she cannot give us a little more time to get forward? This government has not been prolific in providing legislation for the members to peruse and to debate and to understand. It just has not been there. It is almost as if on 1 October they came in and put the phones on hold and have yet to

take them off. I do not know what the pressing government business is that justifies cutting off the opposition's time to discuss in this House.

It is not just the opposition. I have been looking forward to the New Democratic members who sat on the committee with me standing in this House and presenting their views. We want to know what they are about.

1620

Mr McClelland: They're not allowed to express their views. They're told what to say and they don't have a chance. They always agree, whatever.

Mr Brown: They are not allowed to express their views. They do not have much to say on this.

Now when we are talking about this bill, which is draconian, I should bring to the government's attention some of the things that were said in committee and, for the government House leader, some of the things that were said in Sudbury during the committee meetings there. I want to quote from Mr Desormeaux, a representative of the north central region of the United Tenants of Ontario. He had some interesting comments when he came before the committee. I think, if I might just have a moment, I will share them with members. He said:

"When I come down to meetings in Toronto about housing, there is very much a 'them and us' kind of feel to these meetings, and that is not right that it is a 'them and us.' I do not believe that tenants' groups and landlord groups have to be enemies. I believe—this is personally—that most landlords are basically good and they are trying to do their best and most tenants are basically good and trying to do their best and that it is—well, it is kind of realistic at this point that it is assumed that one side is to blame and the other side is not to blame. It is kind of the way things work, but personally, from my experiences with the politics of housing, I think there should be like a no-fault housing situation where we can say it is not the landlord's fault, it is not the tenant's fault, it is not anybody's fault, but it is the housing that has to be created for the people who need it and cannot afford it."

I think that is one of the most sensible things that somebody has said while we were out on committee. This is not a "them and us" issue. Nobody is pro-tenant, nobody is pro-landlord; what we are, I think, if we are doing our job, is pro-Ontario. We are for the individuals who need the housing. We want to provide the housing, and what this government has done with Bill 4 is to totally divide this province into them and us, between the white hats and the black hats. That is what they are attempting to do, and it is certainly not constructive, not constructive at all.

While we were in Sudbury we also heard from Lucille Germain. She is a widow, she is a working person and she is facing very difficult financial times. She owns a small building and spends more on that building per month than she takes in in revenue. She recently did a number of capital expenditures which improved the building. The tenants were appreciative of them. She said to us:

"I am asking you, committee members, am I gouging my tenants? I have in fact been subsidizing my tenants at

the rate of \$570.12 a month for the year 1990. This represents 42% of my personal monthly income.

"If Bill 4 is enacted it would make it impossible for me to recover the cost of these repairs. I will not be able to carry on. I am facing bankruptcy. Those are facts. I am in a financial loss position. My personal savings are being eroded by this constant drainage on my savings to keep up the expense of this property."

That is what she says about Bill 4. She thinks that there needs to be a pass-through of capital expenditures. She understands that. She understands that retroactivity is wrong, retroactivity is bad. I would bet she agrees that we should be able to debate this fully in the House, we should be able to spend some real time understanding the real problems of the real people of this province. That is what she would like to do. She knows that this is bad legislation and she thinks it can be fixed, as we all think it can be fixed, given the time to have the government understand.

I wonder about the six NDP members on the committee. Do they not talk to their friends? Do they not talk to their pals in caucus? Do they not say: "Gee, this is what we're hearing out there. There's something wrong with this law"? Do they not even talk to their pals behind closed doors? I think, as my friend the member for Mississauga West said, there should be blood on the floor of that caucus as they debate the serious issues and the serious misdirection of this bill. I hope at least in caucus they have the nerve to stand up, the six of them, and say: "What we heard out there is totally at odds with what the government is doing here. It's totally at odds."

I might also remind the members that in the past the government party has been quick, when it was over on this side of the House, which was most of the time, to be appalled at this kind of motion. I might quote the Premier on this. He said, "The simple fact is that if this measure is to be allowed, the logical implication of accepting that argument would be that the standing orders would come to mean nothing when it comes to protecting the rights of minorities and regulating the way we do business here." That is what the Premier said about time allocation.

He also said, "It would be far better to have real consensus among all the parties as to how the business of the House should be ordered and some greater willingness on the part of the government to at least listen to those of us who are in opposition, to what we are trying to do." That is what the Premier said, but I guess that was then, this is now.

The Premier has a totally different view of this process, depending on the side of the floor. I am in the maybe unique position—or not unique; there are a number of us in that position who have supported time allocation as a government, but we did that after a long, long period where the opposition clearly told us frankly, in this place and to the newspapers, that it was being obstructionist, that it would not allow the bill to be passed under any circumstances. They told us that it could not happen. In that instance, I think maybe a government has no choice, but I have not heard that in this place. Certainly, our caucus has been co-operative. Our caucus has tried to be constructive in this debate, has tried to further the needs of the people

of Ontario, has not looked at it with ideological blinkers on, has looked at it from a practical point of view: How can we make Bill 4 work? That is just not something that I can see as being obstructionist.

The government House leader seems to suggest that we have been unusually obstructionist, but I cannot see any reason. I do not think the debates show repetitiveness. They do not show us holding things up unnecessarily. I really cannot understand why they want to do this.

Back up in Sudbury, because the government would not allow us to go to Thunder Bay, we had to fly a presenter from Thunder Bay to Sudbury. If the House would just give me a few moments to read this, I think this is a rather compelling bit of testimony on Bill 4. Vickie Marsh said to us, quoting the Minister of Housing:

"In some cases, tenants have been required to pay rent increases of more than 100%. For many, this was tantamount to ordering them to leave their homes.' The dispassionate facts from the Ministry of Housing's own statistics tell quite a different story. Of Ontario's 1.2 million private rental units, in a given year more than 86% receive rent increases of under 5%. Less than 1% receive increases of 30% or more and only 7/100ths of 1%, 84 units out of 1.2 million, fall into the 100% and over category.

1630

"These few 100% increases are then charged back in the press and by politicians to greedy landlords ripping off the system. Again, this is patently untrue. The very few large rent increases which do exist are almost always the result of a combination of at least two out of three important factors: extremely low base rents, a requirement for extensive structural renovation due to age and deterioration, and small building size, usually under 10 units. We ourselves manage a project which had two of the above requirements and had an over 100% increase. We applied for a low-rise rehabilitation program on a 30-year-old 152-unit town home project and, let me add, it was the biggest in Ontario to the time. We had government people coming out our ears up there. Starting rent at this project for a three-bedroom town house was \$192 a month. Some \$3.9 million and three years later, rents are now \$405 a month. The units were completely refurbished both inside and outside, requiring the tenants to physically move out for three to four weeks, with an approximate cost of about \$32,000 being put into each unit. Comparable rents on another three-bedroom town house projects we manage right now in Thunder Bay are \$699 per month. We are still way under market rent.

"Further, of the 152 tenants only 28 left the project. Of these 28, 23 could afford to purchase their own homes.... These figures were kept by ourselves as we were interested in how a project of this scope would affect the tenancy. A rent supplement agreement was also entered into by ourselves with the Ministry of Housing to directly address and assist the problem of those who could not afford housing. Therefore we disagree with the statement that 'thousands of tenants are being economically evicted' by huge increases. Our own experience proves this not to be true."

That is the kind of evidence we heard day to day in the committee.

When we got to clause-by-clause downstairs in the committee, the parties worked well together. The government members had not much to say about anything, but they seemed to at least look uncomfortable when we brought about the retroactivity—

Mr Mammoliti: On a point of order, Madam Speaker: I fail to see what this has to do with the motion. Perhaps the member could explain what all of this has to do. He just continually is off track.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Haslam): Thank you for your opinion. Continue.

Mr Offer: Why don't you start from the beginning so he gets it right?

Mr Brown: He often had trouble in committee following the flow of events too.

I will tell the members that the committee process was very important. We heard a significant number of people, although not all those who wanted to have their views presented to us. I am certain that if we had got to some other parts of the province, we would have heard some views that we did not hear while we were restricted to the few centres the government would allow the committee to travel to.

When the opposition attempted to get this committee to move to other parts of Ontario, we were told over and over again: "This is impossible. We have a tight time line. This is important."

But guess what? This bill is retroactive. If we pass this bill tomorrow or if we pass this bill in two weeks, it makes no difference; it is retroactive to 1 October. So I want to know, what is the big panic over there? Why do we have to get the jackboots out? Why do we have to stomp the opposition? Why do we have to force the opposition to have only two days, one day in committee of the whole and one day in the House? I do not understand.

Mr McClelland: They are afraid of what they are going to hear, Mike. They don't want to hear it.

Mr Brown: They are afraid of what they are going to hear. The government is perhaps setting a precedent. I believe this is the earliest a new government has ever invoked time allocation. I think this is maybe a setting of style—

Mr McClelland: I think the former Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations called it intellectual totalitarianism.

Mr Brown: This is a—

Mr Offer: Is this a joint speech?

Mr Brown: Yes, this is seeming like a duet.

Mr McClelland: This is Mutt and Jeff.

Mr Brown: The government is maybe setting a trend. Maybe open and responsive means open and responsive to a particular segment of Ontarians, to a small group, to a group that knows the right handshake, knows the secret password. Maybe that is who they are open and responsive to, and to the rest of Ontario the socialists are saying, "Well, you really don't have the opportunity to put forth your point of view because we are going to put down the jackboots."

It is going to be interesting over the period of this Parliament to see if this is in fact a precedent, if the government House leader is saying to us, "Look, we have to put up with you guys over there, but that's all we're going to do. We're not going to listen to you at all. We're not going to listen to the views that are represented by the 62% of Ontarians who voted for the opposition. What we're going to do is do what we want to do and that's the way it's going to be."

If this is a trend by this government, then we are in big trouble. The people of Ontario are in big trouble, because a government that is ostensibly open and responsive appears to be only open and responsive to the select few.

I find that offensive. I find it difficult to work effectively as a member of this Legislature. I feel it impugns my responsibilities. I cannot put forth the views of my constituents the way I should.

I have a basic objection, besides the Bill 4 stuff, to just the fact that I think this might signal the opposition being muzzled. They do not want to hear it. That is why they did not want to extend the committee hearings, because when they went out, they inevitably got beat up by both tenants and landlords and anybody else who had an interest. That is why they wanted to cut that off, and that is why they want to cut this off. It is called damage control. "Don't allow people to put forth their points of view because we don't want to hear it. We don't want to know what the real world's about. We have our mindset, we know our ideology, and this is what we are going to do."

I think the most draconian part of this time allocation motion is what it is saying to the future work of this Parliament. It is saying, "We're only going to listen to those special friends of ours. We're not going to pay attention to the other people in Ontario." I find that and the party finds that—and I am sure the Conservatives next to us—totally unacceptable. Ontarians believe in a democratic process.

I would suggest, if the government House leader wants some helpful suggestions, that we could deal with this bill if she would only sit down with the other two House leaders and have a look at what clauses need serious debate, because she will have to agree that the majority of these clauses nobody is in violent disagreement with. As a matter of fact, in principle I think we let them go. If she looks at the committee hearings, she will see that on many clauses there were very few words spoken. There are some contentious ones. I do not know why the government House leader did not sit down with our House leader and the Tory House leader and say, "Okay, these are important clauses. Maybe we should have a couple of hours to do this one. The other one maybe doesn't need as much debate. It could have half an hour," and divide out the committee of the whole so that when we come out of this we have a bill that Liberals could support.

We went into this debate telling the government that we wanted to support this bill, that in principle we supported the rent freeze while it got its permanent legislation in place, but that it needed significant change. The retroactivity clauses had to go, the capital expenditure pass-through had to be changed, but essentially we agreed there

needed to be a pause while we looked at what was happening out there and tried to devise a better system.

1640

The government House leader has a responsibility, I think, to meet with the other two, to sit down and say, "Well, gee whiz, on this clause I think we could have a debate that lasts 45 minutes, on the other one 15 minutes or a couple of hours on this one." I think we would all be agreeable in here. There is no indication whatever that our party has been obstructionist, and I do not think reasonable people should be put in this kind of unreasonable position.

As I wind up my remarks, I would just suggest that I am appalled by this. I do not think at this stage we are anywhere near where time allocation is needed. Reasonable people can work out a reasonable solution. I hope the government House leader will take my suggestions to heart, sit down with the other two House leaders and come to an appropriate decision on what time for which clauses needs to happen on this bill.

Following that, we can go back to having a reasonable debate, as I believe we were having before the government introduced this closure motion, and we can go through the business of the people of Ontario in an orderly fashion.

Mr Turnbull: I am pleased to speak on this important matter. In fact, I sat on the standing committee on general government, which agreed on the amount of time that was to be allocated to that committee to study this bill. Originally it was agreed we would have five weeks to study it in committee and we were clipped back to three weeks by the motion of the NDP people on that committee.

We had over 150 people and groups that were excluded from presenting their submissions to this committee. In fact, on a motion I made to get expert testimony from the trust companies of Canada with respect to potential bankruptcies of landlords because of this act, we were voted down by the NDP, that same group of people who ran last summer on a platform that they were going to offer open government. I guess that was then, but this is now.

They are saying no, they did not want the most qualified people to speak to the question of bankruptcies and mortgages. They did not want them to be heard. This strikes at the heart of open government.

I have to say, as a new member of this Legislature, someone who ran in the last election because I did believe there was something going wrong with government, that I object to the idea that we are being cut off from legitimate debate on this. It is very important that all sides of the issue be brought out. This is retroactive legislation, and retroactive legislation dates back to when they introduced it, so there is no question of urgency. Surely the extra days could be allowed to debate this.

In committee of the whole, we had 10 hours and 33 minutes of debate. That is surely not a lot of debating time compared with other bills that have been brought before this House in other times. Actually, in second reading we had eight hours and 36 minutes of debate. This is a very important piece of legislation. In fact, it is the major piece of legislation in terms of the impact on the province that this government has brought forward so far. Yet on the

very first substantial piece of legislation the government brings forward it applies time allocation.

In the 42 years that the Conservatives governed this province, they brought in time allocation on three occasions, and on each of these occasions they consulted with the House leaders of the other parties. This government thought, after such a short amount of debate on the only substantial piece of legislation it has brought in after six months—and in fact it is getting close to eight months since it was elected—that it wants to bring in time allocation.

As the leader of the Liberal Party said, it is not as if they are backed up with a lot of legislation. We have a very light load in terms of the bills they have brought forward at this moment.

I would like to point out some of the things that in fact the Premier said with respect to time allocation. As I pointed out, there were three occasions when the Conservatives brought in time allocation in 42 years. There were three times that the Liberal Party brought it in in five years, and indeed the Liberal Party and the NDP seem to be accelerating this whole process. Now, after such a short amount of debate, the NDP is bringing in time allocation.

With respect to Bill 68, the auto insurance plan, on 28 March the former opposition leader devoted his two lead questions to it in question period and stated, "The reality is that this government believes it has the right to do whatever the hell it wants to do regardless of the views of the public and regardless of the views of those who oppose."

We were told by the NDP this was a government that was going to be different. If they were only elected, they would have open government, they would govern the province differently. In fact, the public was duped. This government is not governing differently. The minute it finds some resistance from the opposition benches who want to point out the mistakes in this legislation and bring in substantial amendments, the minute we do this, this government brings in time allocation.

The member for Windsor-Riverside, who is now the Minister of Housing, stated on 3 April 1990 about time allocation, speaking of the Liberals, "This government, the majority party...is prepared to do anything to the standing orders in order to get its legislation through, even if it means changing the routine proceedings that we normally go through." He also stated on time allocation: "I would suggest that is incredibly unfair. It will result in the process not holding the government accountable."

The member for Welland-Thorold stated on 17 April 1990, "We want to talk about the auto insurance legislation that the Liberals want to ram through this Legislature without any concern for tradition or procedure and without any concern for democratic function."

The Liberals here at Queen's Park and this government have demonstrated time and time again that they care not a tinker's damn for the role of the opposition. They have demonstrated time and time again their disdain, and indeed we see the tinker's damn that the NDP offers; the same kinds of circumstances, and yet this government brings in time allocation after considerably less debate than this House had even had for the Liberal legislation.

We will look again at what the Premier said with respect to Sunday shopping on 30 January 1989: "I think this imposition of the guillotine is unjustified. It is unworthy of the democratic process that we would come to expect in terms of the government using its majority to simply force through legislation."

The Treasurer said on 24 January 1989: "Fantasy be darned. This is reality. When I start fantasizing, it will not be about closure motions."

We see that the member for Renfrew North said, on the question of time allocation, "It reminds some of us of the happy compromises of an earlier day on important legislation that made this place work in the face of strong opposition and without closure." That was from Hansard of 16 February 1983. He also said, "The past practices in these cases have been for the minister to consider withdrawing the bill, not for ever but until such time as tempers cool, calm heads prevail and conciliatory amendments can be rethought, re-entered and reworked."

Why do we have a group of new people in this Legislature? The majority of members on the government benches were not elected before this last election. Why are they bending their principles, the principles that they said their party stood for to bring in time allocation on an important subject? As I say, this is retroactive legislation and there is no way that if we all vote against that we can stop them. It automatically is enacted as of the date they made it retroactive. That is one of the things we have been fighting about.

1650

The NDP has made all kinds of promises, but it has not kept them. Do members remember the 10.5% mortgage rates that they were going to give farmers and small businesses and householders? They have forgotten that. But as soon as they get something where we make a little wrinkle in their view of the world, they want to bring in time allocation.

Indeed, I attended the House leaders' meeting where our House leader said to the government House leader, "We need more debate," and she said, "Well, how much?" and he said, "Well, until it's debated out; this is important legislation." And we said, "I guess you'll have to do what you have to do." Now, to try to take that out of context and suggest that we were telling the members opposite to apply time allocation is totally wrong. We expected them to keep to their word, the word of their Premier before he was Premier, the word of the Minister of Housing—

Mr Ferguson: Do you want to be debating it in June? Want him to talk about it in June?

Mr Turnbull: The member on the government benches is saying, do we want to be debating it in June, and I think that is a very good question. The same question could have been asked when they were debating extra billing, when they were debating Sunday shopping, when they were debating no-fault. All of those issues were debated more fully in this House before time allocation was brought in.

This is the reality, that we have had tenants who have come to us during the committee hearings and said, "We

want this legislation, but we think retroactivity is wrong." It is in an embarrassment for the government that tenants' groups are saying it is wrong. It is an embarrassment that labour unions are coming and saying it is wrong, that they are losing jobs, that the time of a recession is not the time we should be reducing the amount of work that is being done on buildings. And yet the government has brought in legislation and they do not want any more debate on it because it embarrasses them.

Well, that is tough. In a democracy we are supposed to debate it, we are supposed to bring out the good and the bad and bring those forward for everybody to consider. By allocating time to this and cutting off debate, they are striking at the whole question of people's ability to be governed fairly.

We have seen absolutely no effort by the Minister of Housing to move forward to stop the backlog of applications with rent review and get those worked through. He has not added any extra staff to get rid of that problem that has caused retroactivity for tenants. All he has been mesmerized with is forcing through bad legislation that tenants' groups, landlords and building trades have all said is wrong—the fact that it is retroactive. Why are the government members doing this? Are they not embarrassed to be here, to be doing the things that their party used to roil at and say: "This is wrong. We should have full debate"? Are they not embarrassed that they are doing it in a more expeditious way than any other party has ever done?

There has been no arrangement with the House leaders where they say, "Okay, we'll give you that many extra hours." They are cutting it off prematurely. We have not got all of the amendments on the table. Both the Liberals and the Conservatives have put forward amendments. Some of them are being reintroduced, yes, but some of them are new amendments. They do not want to hear those amendments because doing so does not fit with their agenda. Well, their agenda may be wrong and their timetable may be wrong.

The members opposite should listen to what the people are saying. We have a government populated by people who used to make all these incredibly sanctimonious statements when they were in opposition. The Premier and the Minister of Housing refused to go out to the demonstration on the steps of this Legislature where affected people were demonstrating against it, and yet that same pair were the first to criticize other governments if they did not go out to demonstrations.

Of course they do not like demonstrations. But the fact is, it is people expressing their frustration, and unless the government members are prepared to listen to the people, they are breaking their promise, the promise that they made in the election, in the Agenda for People. They are going to have to live with it in the next election.

But we are not just talking about the election. We are talking about the fact that people are going bankrupt. During all the hearings, everybody on the government side laughed about bankruptcies. Indeed, there are more apartment buildings in this city that are in power of sale at this moment than there have ever been in all of the time that I have lived in Toronto, which is since 1969, exactly as a result of this legislation.

Mr Mammoliti: Oh, you are exaggerating.

Mr Turnbull: I am not exaggerating. We have lots and lots of buildings in power of sale because of this legislation. The government has wiped off 25% to 30% of the value of these buildings.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker: I would like to remind the member to direct his comments through the Speaker, as it is not a debate back and forth, and to stay on the topic, please. Thank you.

Mr Turnbull: Madam Speaker, I feel that this is very much on the topic, the fact that we want full debate on a subject which is important to a huge number of the citizens of Ontario. It is totally in compliance with the promises that were made by the NDP in the last election. The electorate has a right to expect nothing less and indeed every party should stick by its promises. But when a party is sanctimonious and suggests that it would have different sets of values if it were only elected, and then as soon as it is elected, it cuts off debate on the most substantial piece of legislation it brings forward, stops important deputations from groups—

Mr Jackson: Democracy takes a holiday with this government.

Mr Turnbull: It does indeed. We ask the members of the NDP to go back to their caucus and speak to the Premier and say, "We must have proper open debate." Otherwise there is, in this Legislature—I believe I am not allowed to call anybody a "hypocrite," but certainly I would call the platform of the NDP hypocritical if they cut off debate on such an important issue, when all of the facts have not been brought forward, when all of the deputations have not been heard and when you contrast that with the fact that, in all of the 42 years that the Conservatives ruled, they only used time allocation on three occasions. There is indeed something wrong with this government if, on the first test of its promises, it completely swallows them.

Mr Offer: I am pleased to join in this debate, and I must be frank. I had not been planning to be part of this debate, but I have heard some very moving argument this afternoon by members, certainly of the opposition party, and indeed of the third party.

It is interesting that we have not heard argument by members of the government side, but not surprising. I imagine it is not surprising because they are the architects of this motion, a motion which is designed to gag the members of the opposition and the third party and, I must say, very much designed to stop input from the general public. We are dealing with this matter in two ways.

First, we talk about the substance of the bill. But, of course, I recognize that that is not proper, so I will not talk about the substance of the particular legislation which has caused a great deal of concern for a number of people in dealing with not so much the principle of the bill, but really trying to work with members of the Legislature, all members of the Legislature, to make it a better bill, a more effective bill, a bill which really does meet the concerns and the hopes of many people.

1700

The motion that we talk to today is not designed to speak to that substance. Today, what we are talking about is an attempt by the majority government party to stop debate in this House. I have not had time to check this out, but I have been informed that this may be the earliest time in the history of this Legislature that a closure motion has been invoked from an election. That is shameful.

What does that say? It says that there is a government in this province of Ontario that now holds the distinction—I cannot say that it is very enviable—of closing down debate in this Legislature; of closing down the opportunity for members of this Legislature to talk to the substance of a particular bill; of closing down the people of this province from using, as is their right, the members, duly elected through constituency offices, through the Legislative offices, yes, through committee, through committee of the whole, to bring forward their concerns about any particular piece of legislation.

Let us not make light of that because, when all is said and done, that is the most important function that we as legislators will provide: the opportunity for people to be heard, the opportunity for people to avail themselves of our service to comment for or against any particular piece of legislation, policy or initiative, or to bring forward their thoughts and opinions on how those pieces of legislation, initiatives and policies can be improved.

That is our job. That is why we were elected. Hopefully, that is why we stood and asked the people of each of our respective constituencies to vote for us, to say that we feel it is of first priority to be accountable, to be open to the people. This motion stops us from doing that function. This motion effectively curtails not only us from speaking on a matter of importance but, through us, the people of this province.

We have heard from previous speakers of past experiences in this Legislature. We have heard of quotes from speeches of members now in government when in opposition. We have heard of days where speeches and debates of great eloquence were made as to how important it is for us as legislators to be in fact legislators. This chamber does not work if we are stopped from speaking our minds. This chamber does not work if we cannot speak to you, Madam Speaker, and through you to the government, as to the concerns and the hopes of our constituents. This chamber only works when we can freely speak and use the time to bring forward those points necessary in a way which does credit to those who have shared their thoughts with us.

This is an important motion. This is a motion which should not be made light of because this is a motion which strikes to the very fundamental essence as to why we are here this very day at this very hour. We are here because we feel there is a freedom of speech, a freedom which will not be curtailed, a freedom to bring forward matters of substance on any particular piece of legislation. It is the government that, at a very early stage, is taking that away. That is not something that should be made light of. That is something which I believe will stick with this government for many, many years to come.

It will be members on the government side who will have to defend why their party has decided to stop debate. It will be members on the government side who will have to say why they feel it is no longer necessary to listen to the people of this province. It will be those members who will have to defend why discussion, not only on this particular piece of legislation but in principle on all pieces of legislation, is to be cut short.

There are many countries in this world that would very much appreciate having just a pittance of the type of freedom that we have in this province. They would look upon this in surprise. We speak many times, I think all members, about the freedom of speech, the freedom to share one's opinion, the freedom of our elections. Those from other countries look upon this just as a panacea of the very best that can be offered, and I think that they would look and say: "You have this freedom. Why would a government which has such a freedom and has used this type of freedom cut short that type of opportunity for all members of the Legislature?"

Why on earth would anyone think it is right and proper at such an early stage to cut debate in this Legislature? Why? I do not know why. I can hazard a guess, or a few, and I think I might.

An hon member: Please.

Mr Offer: I have been moved to explain maybe why the government does not want to listen to debate. Because it might not be the debate it wants to hear. It may very well be a debate of opposition to a particular piece of legislation on principle. It may be a debate of concern over some aspect of that legislation, but it would be debate, and I think that this government had better learn very quickly that when it brings forward legislation, as it is its right to do, and its obligation and its responsibility, there is also another right, responsibility and obligation on the part of government, and that is, after such legislation is introduced, to listen to comments on that legislation in principle, to listen to concerns on any particular piece of legislation, to listen to amendments, to suggestions for improvement. It is not to say, "This legislation which we have introduced is the very best that can be done and we will no longer listen to members of either the opposition or the third party or to the general public." That is an extremely important obligation on the part of government, and it is one that it has failed in.

1710

The House leader and all members of the government party have failed in this. It has nothing to do with the substance of the legislation; it has to do with the government's obligation as members of this Legislature to listen, to make themselves available to hear comments, concerns, and to allow full and open debate. They have not allowed that. They have followed the Premier or their House leader's whim when they came to the members and said: "Listen, they're making some points on the other side. People have great concerns."

I am so happy to see that the House leader has now come in. I hope that my entry into this debate has been the

calling card for the government House leader to take her seat.

Unfortunately, members of the government side have listened to their House leader, who has said: "Listen, we've got to cut this thing short. We can't allow this opposition party, these members through their constituents, to continue to bring up the good points on the drawbacks of the legislation. We've got to muzzle them. We've got to gag them. We've got to gag and muzzle through them all of the people who are using them, as is their right and obligation, to bring forward comments and concerns."

I must say that I am amazed. I am shocked that the government, so newly elected—not only newly elected but elected on that pedestal of open consultation—would cut the means of communication so short and so viciously.

I guess I am not surprised. I guess it really does not surprise me. I know that there was a meeting in the city of Mississauga which was ostensibly a public meeting. I attended. I know the member for Mississauga South was in attendance. We were told of this meeting, but we were also told that we could not participate. This was a public meeting, but we could not participate and we could not ask a question. But we could walk through the doors, which I guess is a lot better than what happened to some other members, who were not even allowed to walk through the doors of these meetings.

When I got to that meeting—and I know; I have spoken with the member for Mississauga South—we shared our surprise, because this was not a public meeting. This was a meeting held through the Ministry of Housing where there were invited participants. I believe the number, if I am correct, was about eight or nine invited participants.

I have been a member since 1985 and I must say that public meetings are not meetings where there are eight or nine invited participants, where members of the Legislature are not allowed to speak. Public meetings are in fact public meetings, where people can come to wherever that meeting is held, where people can participate, where individuals can express their point of view on whatever the matter happens to be. So I say it is not surprising, because the subject matter of this particular piece of legislation emanates from that same ministry. I know that the House leader is the carrier of this motion, this guillotine motion, this gag order effectively stopping us from speaking.

But I have, and I am sure that all members of this Legislature will recognize it, confined my comments to the motion and not to the substance of the legislation. I have not taken the opportunity of reading a series of quotations, which I happen to have right here, from members of the government side when in opposition. They are very important and I truly hope that members of our side will do that.

This is not a light motion. In fact, this is a motion which very much addresses the very reason for our being here. It is a motion which stops us from expressing opinion. It stops us from working with the government to make a piece of legislation a better piece of legislation, a piece of legislation which addresses the concerns of many people who came before the legislative committee. This motion has said no to that; it has said no to me and all members here. But make no mistake about it, it has said no

to the members of the opposition. It has said no to members being able to do what is so very important in their legislative responsibility.

I am very disappointed in the House leader, whom I have known for a number of years. I am disappointed in this motion's being brought forward at such an early time, before I, my colleagues and indeed her colleagues have had the time necessary to deal with this particular legislation.

This motion is not about a piece of legislation; this motion is about process. This motion is about the fundamental right that each of us has as a result of being elected, selected by the people in our ridings. This motion is stopping us from doing our job. It is with great regret that the House leader, the government has brought forward this particular motion. It is with great regret that I had to speak on this motion, because I would rather not. I would rather be debating the particular piece of legislation.

I note in passing that members of the government side have treated this in a lighthearted fashion, and it may be because they have just been newly elected, but it is crucially important as we proceed that we be able to proceed, that we are able to say what we feel on any particular piece of legislation and to do so without fear of being the victims of this type of closure motion. This is not a good day for debate in this Legislature. It is not a good day when we talk about not being able to speak. It is a day which is very serious. It is one which the government will long regret, because it is certainly one which I will never let it forget.

1720

Mr Tilson: When I look at this motion that has been made by the government House leader, as a new member my greatest surprise is the silence that has taken place in this government from the very outset, not only during the clause-by-clause debate of the committee, which we spent many weeks on, but also the clause-by-clause that has been proceeding with this committee and the silence of this committee. It is indeed the silence of the lambs, because there is silence over there. They just simply do not wish to discuss it.

They had made up their minds, I believe, at the very outset. I think their whole issue of consultation has been a sham. I do not think they intended for one minute to listen to the people of this province, to listen to the constructive criticisms that have been made by the opposition, the suggested amendments that have been made by the opposition, the people who have come to the committee and spent many hours not only preparing for those hearings but also making those deliberations.

There is no question that this government has from the very outset intended to ram this legislation through, and that is exactly what it is proposing to do with this legislation. They talk about how they intend to go out to the province and consult, how they intend to consult with people during the hearings, how they intend to consult with the green paper. That has been their philosophy all along. They are not consulting. They are not listening. They have a timetable, they have not really told us what they are doing and they intend to ram this through.

The green paper consultation that the minister has spoken about I think was the greatest sham of all. It started off that he and the member for Wentworth North and the member for Niagara Falls were to go around the province to different cities. Some of the meetings were alleged to be open; some of the meetings were not. We discovered that some of the open meetings were indeed not open meetings. Some of the members of the opposition have already spoken at length as to how they had difficulty even finding out where these meetings were being held. Our leader spoke of that problem. He had difficulty finding out where the meeting was going to be held in North Bay.

Then after, when it had been announced where the meetings were going to be held, they had difficulty speaking at those meetings. There was some question as to whether they could go to the meetings, but when they finally got to the meetings, there was a great deal of difficulty speaking at those specific meetings. In fact, I can tell the members at first hand from my office that a member from the Ministry of Housing contacted me, as I have indicated in this House in the past. Ministry staff contacted my office, and I believe the Liberal critic, the member for Eglinton, to inform us of specific meetings that we could attend. But at the same time it was made quite clear to us that we could not speak, we could not comment on anything that was going forward.

That is the type of consultation that this government has been developing from the outset. It clearly has used, I submit, tricks with respect to the clause-by-clause debate in the committee. The terms of reference of this whole subject were not only to discuss Bill 4 and to provide clause-by-clause discussion and listen to the people of this province and try to listen exhaustively to the delegations that would be coming to us, but also to discuss the green paper. That has never been done, and I question if it ever will be done. I think this government intends to simply ram Bill 4 through and then I believe it will simply introduce the permanent bill without the consultation on the green paper that it has promised the people of this province. That is how this new government proposes to proceed with one of the most serious economic pieces of legislation it has brought forward.

I think the whole problem with this motion that is before this House is that it is clearly getting too hot for the minister. I am not referring to the fact that he was burned in effigy at a demonstration just recently. I think it is quite clear from the reams of material that have come to him and members of the government from their own constituency offices—people who have talked about how they are losing jobs, how their apartments are deteriorating in quality, how contracts are being broken between suppliers that were going to be providing assistance to the tenants—it is getting too hot for them. They want to end it and that is how they propose to do it.

Clearly, I believe that they are determined to do away with the principle of private enterprise in this province. This Bill 4 is the first of many pieces of legislation—

Mr O'Connor: Come on.

Mr Tilson: Well, show me why not? Clearly the government is not encouraging private enterprise to get into the apartment industry. Can the government tell me one new apartment building that is being constructed since it took office? I do not think there are any across this province, and it is because of their regressive types of legislation. I think it is quite clear that they plan to make this housing industry a public utility, and I for the life of me have no idea where they intend to finance it.

There is nothing to prevent them. They have talked about how the opposition is stalling the housing legislation. If this is interim legislation—they have made it quite clear they are not going to listen to the people of this province; they are going to make it retroactive—there is nothing to prevent them from introducing the final legislation. So what is keeping them? They simply really have not informed the public nor have they informed this House specifically where they are going with respect to their housing policy.

I look at the specific wording of the motion, and one of the items that gives me great concern is that it makes it quite clear that if there are any amendments to be filed, they must "be filed with the Clerk of the assembly by 4 pm on the sessional day on which the bill is considered in the committee of the whole House following the passage of this motion."

The difficulty I have with this clause in the motion is, as we are proceeding in the debate in the committee of the whole, whether it is the government, whether it is the Liberal Party, whether it is our party, the Progressive Conservative Party, whether constructive amendments can be made. Even the government, I hope, will not forget the possibility that even it can make amendments to the bill. But by that clause in this resolution, there is no way that that can be done. "It's our way or not at all." That is what they are saying and I think that is what they have been saying from the very outset. Specifically, I am referring to the clause-by-clause discussions that took place during the committee hearings.

The problem is that there are a great number of issues that need to be dealt with by further debate of Bill 4, and it is regrettable that they are taking the position that they are going to introduce closure to cancel any further debate on this discussion. Two days, the first with respect to this committee and, the second with respect to the third reading, will not adequately deal with one of the most controversial aspects of the bill, the issue of retroactivity.

They simply have not listened to the great number of delegations that have come to us. Maybe they have watched it on television, maybe they have read all of the Hansard reports, but there have been a great many other reports that have been submitted to us that have not been read into Hansard; they have simply been filed with the clerk of the committee. That has to do specifically with the issue of retroactivity. This committee that has spent a great deal of time on the whole subject has not studied those matters to present to this House. It was all very hurriedly done and, as I indicated, even the green paper discussions were not pursued.

The whole issue of capital expenditures has not adequately been dealt with by this committee. Clearly, it has been made clear by Bill 4 that Bill 4 will not allow for capital expenditures, even in an interim period of two months, that must be maintained on a continuous basis to update the capital stock of the housing industry.

1730

There have been situations as a result of the retroactive aspects where people are going bankrupt because they have spent the money. They are under contract to do the work. Capital expenditures have been done but people are going to go bankrupt. The other more serious situation is, why would people make capital expenditures to their buildings? Why would they do that, because there is no way they can be compensated for it? There is no way they can get funding from the banks and that has not been dealt with adequately by Bill 4.

The whole issue of phase-ins of conditional orders has not been adequately dealt with at this level, and I think that to properly review Bill 4, to determine whether or not any further amendments can be made, a great deal of time needs to be spent on that subject.

We have repeatedly requested—and I say we, the members of the third party—have repeatedly asked for experts to come to us on economic aspects of the problems. That is our major concern with Bill 4, how this bill is affecting the economic aspect of the province of Ontario, with respect to jobs, with respect to investment, with respect to the maintaining of the housing industry.

We asked for that during the committee stages, and it would be hoped that this committee would enable members of the opposition, and indeed members of the government, to bring forward information that might assist the government to consider making potential amendments to assist in the detrimental effects this bill will have on the economic aspect of the province of Ontario. That is not sufficient time. Two days simply will not allow for that.

More important is that there were over 100 delegations who applied to speak to the committee and this government refused to hear them. Some of them have sent depositions for us, and of course we have been reading some of them into the record, but over 100 people and organizations who wanted to be heard have not been able to be heard.

Hopefully, because of that, the committee of the whole and all members of the Legislature would enable the members of the opposition and members of the government to repeat concerns that have been made by individuals in their own respective ridings. That is the biggest shock, that members of the government have not been responding even to comments that have been made from their own ridings. I know they are writing to them and if members have not heard comments from their constituents, I am sure they will. I am sure they will be phoning members. They might even be phoning members tonight to show their concerns as to how the government is ramming this legislation through.

The whole issue of extraordinary operating costs is an amendment our party wished to deal with and, specifically,

I do not think there is adequate time to deal with all the issues as well as that.

The whole subject of tipping fees, with respect to waste, is a very important amendment that we feel should be included as a subject of extraordinary operating costs. There will be insufficient time to debate that, to present that information to the members of this committee.

Our party had put forward a democracy clause that would enable the majority, I believe it was 75%, of tenants if they supported capital expenditures that were put forward. Landlords could be able to make capital expenditures if the majority, 75%, of the tenants in a particular building agreed to making those expenditures. I doubt if we will be able to present that in an adequate fashion to explain the effect that will have on the capital expenditure issue of this bill.

The whole subject of increasing the size of the hearing board members: One of the issues that members of this NDP government made during the election, and our party made, was the increasing size of the bureaucracy of all of the rent review legislation. Clearly a proposed amendment by the government which I feel should be discussed further by this committee is increasing the size of the hearing board members, and the cost that is going to have on the taxpayers.

But this government does not seem to care. All it is going to do is spend. This is just a small aspect of their philosophy. They seem to think that money grows on trees and that is not how we are going to solve the housing crisis in this province.

How we are going to deal with it is by getting more people involved, getting private enterprise involved, groups that have been prepared, developers and landlords who are prepared to increase the amount of housing stock in this province, but the government is discouraging them. This government is discouraging them from building further.

The subject of job losses is perhaps another serious aspect that this committee has not adequately dealt with. There are thousands and thousands of jobs being lost. Evidence has been provided to our committee which we are trying to produce in this House which is directly related to Bill 4, about how people are losing their jobs specifically because of this legislation. We will be unable to adequately deal with that problem.

The subject of chronically depressed rents: That is a subject on which the member for York Mills has spent some time with respect to the committee, and we propose to put forward an amendment on the whole subject of chronically depressed rents. The government simply says: "Oh, tough. We will wait for our two-year moratorium period to run out and then we will deal with it." There does not seem to be any sign as to how it is going to deal with that subject.

Finally, most important is the whole effect of Bill 4 on the economy. From all walks of life and all aspects there does not seem to be any sign of listening to the many people who have shown a concern as to the effect of Bill 4 on the economy. The government seems to spend most of its time blaming it on the former Liberal government, blaming it on the federal government and blaming it on

outside interests. That is not a concrete way of going about it.

I would like to refer to one specific area, as I indicated, just to show members an illustration as to how the whole subject of chronically depressed rents has not been raised properly with respect to this committee. In fact, it has not been raised at all, and if this motion passes, I doubt it will receive very much attention at all. It deals specifically with an article that was raised by Michael Bennett of the Toronto Sun on 10 April last in which he referred to an individual by the name of Harry Taylor, who was a carpenter and who had retired in 1987. He had a number of apartments. At that time, the tenants seemed to be satisfied and he seemed to have some ambition to renovate his property. He had purchased the 20 bachelor suites and six one-bedroom units at the end of the 1970s for \$360,000.

The existing rent regulations, of course, we knew led to rent review, and I think the government has commented on it. The NDP has commented on the fact that there developed through time an animosity between the tenants and the landlords. Certainly that occurred with the existing legislation, and Bill 4 has accelerated that animosity between the landlords and the tenants. How are they going to work things out when this government has caused that animosity to reach a high-fever pitch?

With respect to the rent review, the animosity between the landlords and the tenants, Mr Bennett comments that, "It was caught in a maze of hearings on application for increases over and above the annual limit of less than 5%." Mr Bennett states that Taylor's building was home to what the bureaucrats called "chronically depressed rents," with a bachelor apartment going for about \$320.

That was the type of testimony that we heard during our committee hearings, the chronically depressed rent, and that subject has not been dealt with under Bill 4. Maybe it is going to be dealt with under the permanent legislation, but why can it not be dealt with now? The government acknowledges that it is a problem, or if it does not acknowledge it, it should, because clearly it is a serious problem that is causing people like Harry Taylor and others to approach bankruptcy.

Mr Bennett relates the story of Mr Taylor's problem and talks about how he raided his savings account and scrimped on his city of Toronto pension to put \$130,000 into improving his units. Taylor did everything by the book. He filed all the receipts and invoices needed to satisfy the board in 1988 and he was granted an additional 18%. That December his son, who was 25, and who I guess assisted Mr Taylor, unfortunately was killed in a snowmobile accident in Orillia, leaving behind him a house. The house was sold by the estate, by Harry Taylor for \$150,000. Mr Taylor took these moneys, based on the existing legislation and his good faith for a \$30,000 loan, and the \$150,000, plus a loan of \$30,000, all that went into the apartment building last year for modern appliances, plumbing and wiring, again based on the rules that existed today.

1740

The work had to be substantially completed—and those of course are words that all of us are aware of in the

current legislation—before another rent review board would consider his application to recover the money in incremental rent increases. “This time,” Mr Bennett continues, “Taylor wasn’t taking any chances. He spent \$2,000 on a consultant. He says all the paperwork was filed and recorded by last August ‘when nobody thought we’d be getting a new government.’” The Liberals, and I think particularly the New Democratic Party, never thought we would be getting into the situation we are in now.

Soon after the New Democrats came to power on 6 September, Mr Taylor was notified that there would be no sudden changes in the proceedings. Then, of course, the Minister of Housing came along on 28 November and introduced this dreaded bill, Bill 4, which slapped a two-year moratorium on rent review awards. We have talked to some extent about the retroactive effect of that. It essentially stuck landlords, including Mr Taylor, with the cost of the repairs for any work that had been done to that date.

The quote of Mr Taylor that is related by Mr Bennett is: “‘The sickening part is, if any of these 26 rents had been due to be installed before the deadline, all mine would have gone through,’ says Taylor.

“With as many due dates as he had apartments, he tried to simplify things for his tenants. In the process, he may have lost his life savings.”

Then a quote is made by Mr Taylor. He said he had an interview with the Minister of Housing and that he might as well have been talking to the wall. Of course we found out about all that with the green paper discussions; we might as well have been talking to the wall. The Minister of Housing has made up his mind, and that is what Mr Taylor found out.

He says, “His MPP, Marg Ward, told him the government had to do something to stop ‘offshore speculators’ from flipping buildings for fast profits.” Can members imagine a member of this Legislature explaining to Mr Taylor that it is because of offshore speculators flipping apartments for fast profits that Bill 4 was implemented? We have never really had a chance in this resolution or in this debate to discuss this whole subject of why Bill 4 came into existence.

Mr Taylor concludes by saying: “All my tenants used to think I was the greatest guy in the world. Now I’ve got 26 people who hate my guts and I can’t stand the sight of them—all because this damn government got involved.” Those are the words of Mr Taylor. He is probably going to go bankrupt because of this government, this do-not-care government, with respect to Bill 4. Clearly we are going to be unable to discuss the subject of chronically depressed rents.

Some time has been spent with respect to the previous use of time allocation motions. I would like to discuss some of that now. On Bill 94, which had to do with extra-billing, in June 1986, the time allocation came in after 147 hours of debate; Bills 113 and 114, the famous Sunday shopping legislation, January 1989, that time allocation came in after 200 and 139 hours respectively for each of those bills; Bill 162, in July 1989, the Workers’ Compensation Board legislation, a time allocation resolution was put forward after 163 hours of debate; auto insurance,

which is the one that perhaps many members recall more recently in April 1990, the famous Bill 68, time allocation was put forward, and of course we have heard a smattering of comments made by the current government members as to what it thought of that. They gave these people an awful time. They thought what they were doing was a terrible thing to do. They did not have an adequate time to discuss the whole subject of auto insurance. Of course, the former Sunshine Boy spent a great deal of time on that, but that was after 123 hours of debate.

With respect to Bill 4, second reading debate took 8 hours, 36 minutes. The committee of the whole at that time took 10 hours, 6 minutes. The total debate time in the House at that time was 19 hours and 9 minutes; public hearings took 78 hours, 15 minutes; clause-by-clause, 26 hours, 37 minutes. The total debate time in the standing committee on general government was 104 hours, 52 minutes.

The total debate time—and I would like members to refer back to the times I just gave them with respect to extra-billing, Sunday shopping, workers’ compensation and auto insurance—the total debate time with respect to House and committee was 124 hours, 1 minute. Yet this government was enraged, when it was in opposition of course, by the conduct of the Liberal government with respect to actions it was taking.

But this government seems to have a mind of its own. It is not prepared to listen and it is prepared to ram through the legislation, and that is regrettable. I would just like to refer to a couple of members of the government and how they feel about time allocation motions. Specifically, in July 1989, Bill 162, with respect to workers’ compensation, there is an interesting quote I would like to refer the House to by the now Minister of Housing.

At that time he said: “This motion proposes two days in committee of the whole. I think two days to deal with 27 government amendments is unreasonable and, again, an abuse of the minority.” He does not think so now. “I submit that two days is clearly inadequate and clearly an abuse.” He does not think so now.

“The Speaker must protect the process...” and of course this was on a motion of order, but the concept of where the Minister of Housing was coming from at that time is quite clear. He continued: “The Speaker must protect the process and must protect the minority. This process should be democratic, and it is not democratic and it is not free when the opposition and members of the Legislature are unable to hold the government accountable.”

That is all we are trying to do, to hold his government accountable. We can quite clearly see what they are trying to do. If they can shut us up, we will not be able to do that. The Minister of Housing continued:

“This motion puts limits on the committee of the whole that are totally unreasonable. I understand that the opposition parties have limits on them, but those limits, when they are put in a closure motion like this, must be reasonable. I submit that they are not reasonable at all when we are suggesting two days. We cannot contemplate and the government cannot contemplate how many additional amendments might be moved.”

Of course, that was the point I was trying to make with respect to the time frame of submitting amendments. We do not know, but they are not even going to consider amendments. They are not going to allow any more amendments, only the ones that have been filed. That is all. Tough luck. Out.

The Minister of Housing continued:

"It may well be that we have 27 amendments; it may be that Liberal backbenchers have some amendments to put to this legislation." Again, I say it may well be that the New Democratic backbenchers will have some suggestions to this amendment, that hopefully they will not sit on their hands and again be "Silence of the Lambs."

"To try to deal in two days with a minimum of 27 amendments, and a maximum of I do not know how many, completely destroys the process.

"The final point I would like to make is that this motion presented by the government House leader prejudices the members of the Legislature. The government is assuming that there are going to be only 27 amendments and it is saying that two days is adequate to deal with those 27 amendments. We have no idea whether there will be additional amendments....

"How can we as a Legislature possibly deal fairly with an individual member's amendments if, at the end of two days, any member in this Legislature could have moved an amendment and there will not even have been arguments pro and con for that amendment, yet we as a Legislature are supposed to judge those amendments and get up the second sessional day under the motion and vote? I suggest to you, Mr Speaker, that this is unfair. It does not offer any protection for the minority in this place...."

Those were comments made by the present Minister of Housing, who is presumably in cahoots with the House leader in trying to shut up the opposition.

The minister continues: "...this is an unprecedented motion that prejudices the process and provides for closure not only on the bill itself but on every possible amendment and the amendments that have not even been dealt with or debated in a standing committee or in the Legislature itself.

"We also suggest that two days in the committee of the whole to deal with amendments is inadequate and does not allow the opposition to appropriately play its role of holding the government accountable.

"Finally, it prejudices individual members and members of other than the executive council and the role they are supposed to play in this place when we are dealing with legislation."

Those are the words of the present Minister of Housing, but he seems to have changed his tune since gaining power. He seems to have changed his tune. I can assure the House that I and members of my party are most concerned as to that position.

I would like to refer members to another comment with respect to time allocation. This was made, again, by the Minister of Housing and this was on bill—

Mr Tilson: At that time he was just a Joe over there. He was discussing Bills 113 and 114 and this was in January 1989. He was speaking on time allocation and he said: "Time allocation, I think, is a sad commentary on this government. It is a sad commentary on a majority that has become more and more removed from the people of this province," and, of course, he was speaking about those people.

"There was not a lot of discussion on Bill 114. I think what this government has done is to use its majority to force these bills on an unwilling Legislature, which is very clear. More important than the Legislature, the government is using its majority to force those bills on an unwilling public."

Mr B. Murdoch: Who said that?

Mr Tilson: The Minister of Housing said that.

Then we had the current Treasurer make a cute little quote. This was in 1989 as well. He said on 24 January 1989, and I am referring to Hansard: "...the majority of members in this assembly were not on that committee and serve on other committees. It is very difficult for members of the chamber to serve on a number of committees, let alone go to one all the time."

I think the current Treasurer has made a very good point as to the whole process, as to what we are doing, and that is that all members of the assembly cannot go to the committee where we have these discussions. That is why we go in committee of the whole to further discuss it when we are all present. Clearly we are not being allowed to do that, and clearly even members of the government and members on the back benches are not allowed to do it. Clearly they have been instructed not to say anything as well because of their silence today and their silence on the committee.

I raised a question on the subject of fairness at question period recently. I asked specifically the member for Niagara Falls about the whole issue of fairness, and I do not think we had adequate time to talk about the subject of fairness with respect to this debate. I asked the member for Niagara Falls. I then asked the Premier, who then shuffled it off to the Minister of Housing. He did not know what fairness was either.

I asked him specifically what was fair, given that they submitted during the election that this government was different. That it was going to be a government that was fair, that it was going to be a government that was accessible. Members should keep in mind these words when they have seen the process of what this government has been doing with respect to Bill 4—not allowing 100 people to speak, not allowing the green paper discussions to take place. In fact the minister's so-called green paper discussions consisted of private meetings with tenants, private meetings with landlords and then some public meetings. Even at those public meetings, people were not allowed to speak. Members of this Legislature were not allowed to speak. The two opposition critics were not allowed to speak.

I think this government should talk to us about what it thinks is fair, because clearly when you start talking about retroactivity and the people who are going bankrupt, the jobs that are being lost, it is important to know exactly

where this government stands on the whole subject of fairness. Now, the government members got a little excited a few minutes ago when we started talking about how the members of the government were going to make the housing industry a public utility. I do not know where they are going to get the money for that. I have raised in this House in the past the tremendous amount of money that has been spent by the province of Ontario with respect to housing, and it is going nowhere. Bill 4 certainly is not improving that situation; in fact, it is going the other way.

The Liberals committed \$3 billion to construct 30,000 units under the Homes Now program, and they spent an additional \$300 million in additional operating subsidies over 35 years. That was their commitment. So as to Homes Now, Project 3000, Project 3600, when these units come on stream, operating subsidies will reach over \$875 million by 1993-94, with an annual mature cost of \$1 billion. One billion dollars. This is an increase, as I have indicated in the past, of over 300% from the Ministry of Housing's 1985-86 budget of \$243 million.

I, for the life of me—and Bill 4 certainly is not revealing it—do not know where this government thinks the money is going to come from. The taxpayers cannot do it. They have had enough. The people of this province cannot afford what this government has plans for with respect to Bill 4 and similar legislation. These costs that I have just

referred to are all before the Treasurer allocates an additional \$3 billion.

We cannot afford to build every housing unit in this province, and that is clearly where this government intends to go. We cannot afford it. This government must realize that taxpayers have been pushed to their limit.

I, for the life of me, have been asking this government, not only during the committee stages, but during this stage, to work with the private sector to build additional rental housing stock. I have specifically asked how it is going to encourage private enterprise, the developers, to build new housing. All that seem to be coming forth are the non-profit housing, the Homes Now programs and some of these other government initiatives. There does not seem to be anything that the government has in mind, certainly not from Bill 4, and I think that two days to deal with the issues I have listed—we simply do not have enough time to adequately deal with that whole subject. Clearly we need to rethink Bill 4. We need to spend more time on it, because it is only going to make things worse.

Several days ago, the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association called a press conference with respect to the state of housing in this province. They made it quite clear that there was a crisis on our hands.

The House adjourned at 1800.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
10	407	2	30	<p>minding him of that in the House today.</p> <p>Mr Stockwell: After the pounding that those people took, I am not sure anyone would call them the enemy any more.</p> <p>With respect to the wonderful comments from the member for Lake Nipigon, I stand behind the statement that I firmly believe we have way too many employees provincially, that they are way overpaid and they are way underworked. I have no problem with that statement. I have always made that statement.</p> <p>Some hon members: Shame.</p> <p>Mr Stockwell: There is no shame in that statement. If the members opposite do not believe it, then they are living in Shangri-La. They have not gone out to a work site provincially, or been to the Ministry of Transportation at Keele St and Highway 401, or seen some of the operations that take place. If they believe this government is efficient, they need a lot of help, because this government is not efficient, never has been efficient, probably never will be efficient, because government is basically an inefficient operation. Very few governments have other governments in competition. That breeds efficiency. It matters not what the person thinks of the province of Ontario. If he wants to do business with the government, he has got no other option. He must go to the government offices, because there is nobody else in business competing against them.</p> <p>With respect to the comments from the member for St Catharines on slamming Liberals, I do not have any difficulty with the statements made by the member for Leeds-Grenville, but I do agree with him on one point. Yes, I think the enemy is on the other side. I do not have any difficulty in directing my comments that way. The Liberals lost the election, we lost the election, they won the election. They are supposed to be implementing policies and procedures. They are obviously not. They are supposed to be putting forward the Agenda for People. They are obviously not. They are supposed to, as his leader said, be doing work, doing business. They are obviously not. I wish they would do something, but if they are going to do the budget, the only thing I ask is no deficit, no new taxes, become a little bit responsible.</p>

1640

Mr Christopherson: I appreciate the opportunity to join in this debate. I listened with interest to the critic of the Treasury from the third party and, as always, found it interesting, stimulating. However, I also found it to be representative of a very narrow viewpoint of how the province ought to be run and I found it representative of a very small segment of the population, since I think that every position that the honourable member articulates was very much enunciated in the last election and I do not believe, quite sincerely, that anywhere near the majority

of the population of the province holds those views. I do not mean that in a partisan fashion, except to say that there has been a recent poll that makes a difference. I am talking about the election, where all of this was talked about. So to suggest that this government and this party are completely out of touch with what the people of Ontario want, I have a great deal of difficulty accepting that as being the reality.

Just a few points, if I might, because I think they need to be acknowledged. First of all, I find it interesting that the member for Etobicoke West would hold the position that all governments and everything that is done in the public arena is bad for the citizens of Ontario or for the population at large. I gather that he would be much more comfortable if there were references to the Stockwell hospitals that would exist throughout the province or the Stockwell schools that would exist or the Stockwell police department and a number of the other important public sector services that are provided by the government for the public. I understand that if you were to go into the United States or to other jurisdictions, it might be arguable and it might be acceptable that some of those examples would be acceptable in the private sector. I would suggest that clearly Ontarians and Canadians in general reject that.

Mr Stockwell: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: The member is standing up suggesting that there were examples I used that should be privately run operations. Not once have I ever used those examples, and I would ask, if he is going to give examples, that he use accurate reflections; if not, that he not use them.

The Deputy Speaker: That is a remark that you have passed. It is not a point of order.

Mr Christopherson: I guess the member can dish it out, but he does not feel he can take it. I wish to be fair. I am suggesting that the impression and the arguments used, if extended or if used as examples, could include what I am suggesting. I do not believe, if the member checks the Hansard, that I was clearly suggesting or misleading anyone listening to a different conclusion. I get tired of hearing consistently that social programs have to be cut, that government itself is inefficient and that there are services provided that clearly could be better delivered by the private sector just because it is the private sector. I do not accept that and I do not believe that the people who elected me or the people who elected this government accept that point of view. That is why I am taking the time to raise the points in argument.

The opposition parties like to suggest that this government is afraid to talk about the word "competitiveness" and to recognize the needs of business. I would ask any of those who want to include those suggestions in any of their further speeches to perhaps check the speech that the Premier made, not to a business audience, not to a constituency that would want to hear that message, but to his party at the first convention following our election to government. In it he talked about the need for competitiveness for business in this province and about the need for a viable, strong economy. He said we will do everything we can to make the business sector as strong as possible,

because quite frankly he saw it as the other pillar for providing the kinds of social programs and social justice in which he believes and in which this government believes.

I think it needs to be said very clearly that this government is prepared to acknowledge the need to remain competitive and to take the measures that are necessary that we feel would provide and put this province on a competitive footing, as we have serious and massive changes, not only around us in the context of Canada and North America but indeed on a global level.

There have been suggestions that the anti-recession program has not met the mark, but I must say that, quite frankly, I have found the criticisms and the attacks by the opposition members on our anti-recession package and anti-recession measures to be very weak and ineffective. I believe that that measure was an amount of money that has been accepted, by and large, by the people of this province, and business—I would hasten to offer an opinion on—has agreed that the amount of money was the correct balance between recognizing that deficit spending is something we have to be very cautious of but that in a time of recession governments do have a responsibility to do what they can to offset the very serious and human damage that happens during the course of a recession.

I would say that, other than a few details and a few

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic Development
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Jansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Jarnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Jarrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Jarris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Jaslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Jayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Jenderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Leimbach, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathyssen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Ron Hansen, Karen Haslam, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Margery Ward, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Winter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathyssen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Sharon Murdoch, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Noel Duignan, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Bob Huget, George Mammoliti, Irene Mathyssen, Bill Murdoch, Paul Wessinger, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Brian A. Charlton, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Paul R. Johnson, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Bob Huget
 Vice-chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, Brian A. Charlton, Marilyn Churley, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Marilyn Churley, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Irene Mathyssen
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 15 April 1991

Members' statements

Health care	667
Mr Henderson	
Traffic signals	667
Mr Cousens	
Constitutional reform	667
Mr White	
Race relations	667
Mr Phillips	
Electricity supply and demand	668
Mr Jordan	
Wine industry	668
Ms Harrington	
Cross-border shopping	668
Mrs Y. O'Neill	
Accessibility for the disabled	668
Mr Turnbull	
Volunteers	669
Mr Ferguson	

Statement by the ministry

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	669
Ms Gigantes	

Responses

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome	670
Mr Phillips	
Mr Eves	

Oral questions

Doctors' fees	671
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Garbage disposal	672
Mr Nixon	
Mrs Grier	
Mr Cousens	
Wage protection	674
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Automobile insurance	675
Mr Chiarelli	
Mr Charlton	
Toronto Islands community	675
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Cooke	
Washroom facilities	676
Mr Perruzza	
Mr Mackenzie	

Hunting in Algonquin Park	677
Mr H. O'Neil	
Mr North	
Cross-border shopping	677
Mr J. Wilson	
Mr North	
Hydro projects	678
Mrs Mathysen	
Ms Carter	
Violence against women	678
Mrs Fawcett	
Ms Akande	
Assistance to farmers	679
Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Buchanan	

Motion

Committee membership	679
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	680

Petitions

Garbage disposal	680
Ms S. Murdock	
Nursing homes	680
Mr Brown	

Government motion

Time allocation, motion 16	680
Miss Martel	680
Mr Nixon	682
Mrs Cunningham	685
Mr Brown	687
Mr Turnbull	692
Mr Offer	694
Mr Tilson	696
Adjourned	701

Other business

Visitor	671
The Speaker	
Question period	679
Mrs Haslam	
Mr Elston	
Adjournment	701
Erratum	702

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	704
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	707

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 15 avril 1991

Déclaration ministérielle

Syndrome immunodéficitaire acquis	.669
M ^{me} Gigantes	



ISSN 1180-2987

**Legislative Assembly
of Ontario**

First Session, 35th Parliament

**Official Report
of Debates
(Hansard)**

Tuesday 16 April 1991

**Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario**

Première session, 35^e législature

**Journal
des débats
(Hansard)**

Le mardi 16 avril 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 16 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ASSISTANCE TO KURDS

Mr Ruprecht: We have a number of concerns on this side of the House about the insensitivity of the NDP government and its inability to come to the help and aid of the Kurds. We are reminded on a daily basis about the suffering and untold hardships of the Kurds. They suffer and experience hunger, disease and starvation. Hundreds of children are dying every day.

It was not long ago when the government mobilized millions of dollars to go to war in the Middle East. Then suddenly, when it comes to helping people, the roads are too bad, too steep, the mountains are rained on, the money is tight, the helicopters cannot get through. The Premier was in his chair when we were the government and announced help and aid to Mexico, to Italy, to Ecuador, to Colombia. What we are asking today is to ensure the same kinds of statements are being made and help is being provided.

We are asking this government, the Premier, the Minister of Citizenship to make a statement, because without their help and aid the Kurds are abandoned to their death.

WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES

Mrs Witmer: I was shocked and appalled to learn that one out of every four women who seek treatment at the Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital's detoxification unit, which is the only one in the region of Waterloo, is turned away because of a shortage of beds.

This government has an obligation to ensure that all people in this province have equal access to health care. The fact that a hospital has to turn away female patients because there are insufficient beds is unacceptable in a province which used to take great pride in its health care system.

I am very concerned that the shortage of beds is particularly affecting women. Of the 21 beds at the detoxification centre, only three are set aside for female patients. A representative of the Addiction Research Foundation of Waterloo region was recently quoted as saying: "The system has been less sensitive to the needs of women. In the development of addiction treatment, the system has been designed by men for men."

I strongly urge the Minister of Health to investigate this situation and ensure that the women of this province have access to the treatment they so desperately need. We must recognize that it is very hard for these women with alcohol problems to come forward in the first place and seek help, and to be turned away when they do so only makes their problem worse.

ANTI-RECESSION PROGRAM

Mr Perruzza: The recession continues to cripple the numerous hardworking Canadians. This is particularly true for the people of Downsview, a predominantly working-class riding where an overwhelming number of families depend on the construction industry and branch-plant industries for their livelihood. As we have witnessed, the free trade agreement, high interest rates and the high Canadian dollar have virtually brought the construction industry to its knees.

Families have for the first time since the Great Depression seen their life savings eroded and their jobs moved south of the border. These families are fast losing hope and are looking to the government to regain any sense of dignity they have lost throughout these turbulent economic times.

I know our government has done its fair share in rebuilding the provincial economy by allocating \$700 million in capital works projects which, by the time it is finished with municipal and local support, will have grown to well over \$1 billion and created roughly 20,000 much-needed short-term jobs.

We know our government cannot pull us out of this recession alone. We need a concerted and co-operative effort from all governments in this country. It is incumbent on Brian Mulroney as Prime Minister of Canada to call a first ministers' conference on the economy and work with our Premier and the other premiers to map out an economic recovery strategy for this province and this country.

RACE RELATIONS

Mr Curling: Each day racism raises its ugly head. I am sure all members of the House are quite aware of the disturbing events taking place in Metropolitan Toronto's detention centres. Over the past years, employees at the Scarborough jail have been subjected to discriminatory behaviour on the part of their employers at the jail. I am well aware of these problems. In my capacity as the member for Scarborough North as well as the opposition critic on race relations, I receive many complaints from employees of the jail who have reported blatant racist and sexist incidents taking place there.

I have visited the Metro East Detention Centre myself in order to assess at first hand the impression of what the situation is all about. It is so bad that four jail guards have filed complaints with the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

On a number of occasions in this House, I have reminded the members of the tremendous backlog currently immobilizing the human rights commission. The process is so bogged down that it can take months or even years to resolve complaints such as these. What are these employees to do in the meantime?

So far in this administration, we have heard a great deal of rhetoric about eliminating racism. The Minister of Citizenship has announced a new anti-racism secretariat

which will take months to set up. The minister herself said that "our government has the political will to confront racism head on." I call upon the Minister of Citizenship to prove that her government has the political will to fight racism by fast-tracking these complaints to the human rights commission and by imposing real sanctions, not like the ones imposed on employment agencies that we saw that discriminate, on those who perpetuate racism and sexism in our society.

1340

CHILD CARE

Mr Jackson: I am pleased to call the attention of all members of the House to the current day care crisis in Ontario.

The NDP announcement in January to commit about \$50 million to child care funding in this province fell far short of the \$250 million promised in its agenda for election. Rather than working in co-operation with all day care agencies to meet the needs of Ontario children and their parents, the NDP decided instead on a course of confrontation against the private centres by only providing pay equity enhancement to those working for public agencies.

The Minister of Community and Social Services openly discriminates against thousands of women employed in private day care. These women suffer the further indignity of hearing this minister say during estimates that while there is no money for them, the Treasurer in fact has funds in place to buy out the centres that employ them. So much for a co-operative approach to government.

The NDP is also forcing Metro Toronto to double day care costs to meet its \$12-million shortfall for this year alone and to address the demands for 7,500 additional day care spaces. Prior to 1986, the provincial day care contributions stood at 80%. However, the NDP will say, as has become its custom, that that was then and this is now.

The working poor in Toronto now face increased day care costs they will not be able to pay. Thousands of women employed in commercial centres are being discriminated against, Ontario children continue to be vulnerable under this government and now is the time to stop the rhetoric. Children and the parents of poor families across Ontario want this government to undertake some action on their behalf now.

SAFE NEIGHBOURHOOD INITIATIVE

Mr Frankford: I would like to inform the House through you, Mr Speaker, that a building in my riding of Scarborough East has been designated under the safe neighbourhood initiative of the Metro Toronto Housing Authority. That building at 3847 Lawrence Avenue East is part of MTHA's \$5-million program to enhance safety and security in its properties.

Those of us who represent ridings in which there are MTHA units have a special interest in improving the living conditions for its tenants. Too often in the past, the level of consultation has been problematic. However, with the safe neighbourhood initiative the community will take steps to fix itself from the ground up, rather than waiting for it to be done from the top down.

I am pleased that this program has been undertaken. I believe this co-operative venture among MTHA management, tenants and the police is a positive step in the ongoing battle to make MTHA livable and, in addition, to give residents and other stakeholders a real say in effecting change on a series of issues that affect their lives directly.

MTHA's Jean Augustine and general manager Byron Hill introduced that program at a tenants' meeting last week. Those on my staff who attended the meeting tell me the proposal met with the strong support of all interested parties, and I applaud those who have undertaken this bold initiative. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to receiving updates on their progress.

VISITORS

Mr Callahan: Freedom and democracy are to be treasured by all people. They are only missed when they are lost, and the guardians of freedom and democracy are our young people of this country.

In that vein, I would like to welcome to the Legislature for a visit, for the purposes of acquiring knowledge and becoming the protectors of freedom and democracy, the class of Earnscliffe Senior Public School and their teacher, Mr Guiney, and some parents, who have come to the Legislature to learn about it.

I would ask all members to greet that rather large contingent that is sitting in the opposite gallery. They are here to protect, to observe and to make sure that freedom and democracy prevail. Who knows, up there in that gallery there may very well be the next member of the Legislature for Brampton South when this party becomes too old and decrepit to carry out that function. But I greet them and wish them well and hope they enjoy their stay here and their tour.

It is unfortunate that they cannot remain for question period in order to observe democracy in its essence, when the government across the aisle will be bringing in closure which will effectively muzzle the opportunity of the elected representatives in this House to debate issues as is their right, their obligation and their duty, having been elected to this Legislature. It is unfortunate they cannot stay to see that, but perhaps the government will recant and allow democracy to reign free again in this Legislature.

GOVERNMENT'S RECORD

Mr McLean: My statement concerns a government that has reneged on its promise to be open and accessible to the people of Ontario. In the throne speech that opened the first session of the 35th Parliament of Ontario, the Premier said: "...my government will open Queen's Park to those who have never before had an effective voice in the corridors of power. It is a government that will listen to the people and respond to their needs to the best of its ability." I must underline "best of its ability."

The government has failed to live up to this promise. I would like to focus on the Minister of the Environment to show two of many examples of this government's failure to be open and accessible to the people.

First, Gordon Elder, president of Big Cedar Estates, a resident-owned community of 230 homes in Hawkestone,

wrote to the minister on 12 December 1990 appealing to her to approve a self-operated water utility. It took the minister four months to reply to Mr Elder in a letter dated 7 April. The minister said she is concerned about the backlog in approvals and that initiatives would be implemented to speed up the approval process. The minister still could not make a decision after holding on to this letter for four months.

Second, I received a number of complaints from developers and municipal planners in my riding about the ministry's delay in approving public works subdivision projects. They were initially told it takes six months. Six months passed and then they were told to wait an additional six months. These approval delays will result in a significant expense to developers.

When is the minister going to speed up the process?

COMMUNITY JUSTICE WEEK

Mr Mills: I am here to rise today on a positive note, to inform the House that we are privileged to have with us today in the gallery high school law class students from City School and SEED School in Toronto and ASE II Scarborough Alternate Education High School. Last Thursday I was honoured to launch Community Justice Week in my home riding of Durham East. Today these students helped us launch the event here at Queen's Park.

They have just seen the official première of Just...For You. This video illustrates to high school students how the justice system works and the roles we all may play to make justice work. This video was produced by the ministries of the Attorney General, Solicitor General and Correctional Services. It is being shown and discussed throughout the province. Our guests today have demonstrated their interest in the justice system through their course of study. They serve as excellent examples of what Community Justice Week is all about and the importance of such public education programs.

I thank them for their interest and for their participation, and I thank the other students in schools throughout Ontario who are participating in Community Justice Week events.

VISITORS

The Speaker: I invite all members of the assembly to welcome to our midst today three elected members from the Belorussian Parliament, which sits in Minsk: Dr Zianon Pazniak, Uladimir Zablocki and Leanid Barshcheuski.

1350

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

HOME SHARING

Hon Mr Cooke: I am pleased today to announce that my ministry has extended funding for the home sharing program for another year.

Home sharing is a locally run service which helps match people who need affordable rental housing with people who have accommodation available in their homes. Last year, home sharing services in Ontario helped more than 1,700 people find new homes.

This new money means that 16 existing home sharing agencies which provide this excellent service will be able to continue their good work. We will also have additional money available for a number of other communities that have shown an interest in starting a home sharing service. In total, we will provide \$700,000 this year for home sharing agencies.

One of the home sharing program's most appealing features is its community-based nature. It brings together local groups interested in helping people—whether seniors, single parents or students—find affordable housing in their communities. Home sharing also helps households which rent space in their homes. For example, senior citizens enjoy the advantages of companionship, shared housekeeping chores and extra rental income. The program also boosts the availability of housing. Often the people who move into matched accommodation free up the housing they left. This creates a vacancy, allowing other people to move into their former homes.

Home sharing is a cost-effective, community-based approach to finding affordable housing for people who need it. We are proud as a government that we have decided to extend this program.

RESPONSES

HOME SHARING

Mr Elston: It is interesting today that we have the member for Windsor-Riverside, the Minister of Housing, standing in this place to reannounce a program that was begun by my colleague the member for Scarborough North. While he has some good words for the program today, he is really changing his view from the heights of his ministerial chair, perched behind a high stack of policy papers gathering dust on his desk.

This man has done very little indeed to assist in what has been described in the papers in the reports indicating a crisis in rental housing in Ontario, that there is in fact a \$3-billion boost needed to construction for housing in this province. What he has done again, as the member from St Catharines has so rightly and ably pointed out time and again, is he has repackaged, reannounced and reaffirmed his commitment to programs which have been in existence for some time.

It seems to me the reason that the member for Windsor-Riverside was put in his post as Housing minister is quite clear. It is key because he and his party have reversed themselves on all the traditional party programs which they used to talk about in opposition. Where are the 20,000 units of the agenda for power that they ran on last August and September? Where are they indeed? They are but a figment of the imagination now, a gleam in the eye of some policy person who used to work in the member for York South's office on the second floor of the Legislative Assembly in 1990.

They are a figment of the imagination because the Treasurer, the member for Nickel Belt, has taken away any of the flexibility that the Minister of Housing has had to build houses in a way that would answer the crisis, which is real and pressing in the province of Ontario. They have not done what they said they would do, and what is more,

while the crisis grows day by day in the unemployed ranks of construction workers in this province, these people sit by and smile as they applaud a \$700,000 extended program that has been designed to convert some houses that are already in existence.

We see nothing wrong with the fact that they are again reannouncing one of our programs, but what we do take issue with is the fact that they are patting themselves on the back at a time when inactivity is despoiling the very economic basis of development for the province of Ontario. While people cry out with needs that are real, these people are patting themselves on the back in such a way as to strangle their own initiative and creativity. We used to believe this stuff in the agenda for power, but again it is no longer to be seen.

Let's talk about a couple of the items which were to go hand in hand with the 20,000 units that are not coming on line. Let's talk about the 10.5% mortgages available so people could buy their new houses. Where are those people going to find this 10.5% money from the government program that he is not bringing forward to help in housing the people in the province? Where is that program? Where is the \$1.4 billion? It is safely tucked away in the Treasurer's piggy bank which he sits upon day by day as people go to him to try to get him to release some money for the caring and necessary action required to help the poor people in this province.

It is very interesting indeed that while these people talk about the need to assist people in having affordable housing, they again have breached several of their commitments. One of those commitments is talked about in the news today issued by the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation. It speaks very clearly to the issue of affordability of housing when they ask, who is to blame for the cost of rising taxes? There is a paragraph of which I would like to make people aware. It says:

"The provincial government, as an election promise, stated that it would return to funding 60% of educational costs. The latest general legislative grant figures reveal that in fact education funding has fallen from 41.5% to 40.8%. When decisions such as these are made federally or provincially, it is the home owner who bears the brunt of the cutback through additional property taxes."

While they indicate that this very limited response is addressing some needs, they have added to the crisis not only by failing to respond to rental housing, but also to the home owner. It is terrifyingly inadequate.

Mr Tilson: With respect to the statement from the Minister of Housing, I keep waiting for some sort of development as to where the minister is going with respect to his housing policy in this province. Clearly, if this is the start of it, it is probably the start of the greatest sham this province has ever seen.

Clearly, as I understand it, this is a renewal of the previous program initiated by the Liberals, the five-year program which ended in 1989. At that time, I believe \$700,000 was put forward by the previous government, so if I read this particular statement by the minister it would appear that he is reducing the program, particularly if he is going to be expanding it to other communities, because I

assume from that, when there are 16 existing home sharing agencies that are going to continue that he is going to expand it to the other areas on the same moneys. Clearly either those existing home sharing agencies are going to stop or the whole program is going to be downplayed, so it is clearly rhetoric on the part of the minister. He knows he has a problem with respect to his policies. He knows that the people of this province have come to the conclusion that he has nothing to offer with respect to solving a very serious housing program that has been put forward every week by different groups around this province.

This program does not do anything to deal with bringing back the initiatives that are needed to encourage housing to be built in this province. It does nothing to bring back the confidence of investors that has been lost by Bill 4. It does none of those things. I think all it is is clearly public relations grandstanding. I understand that 75% of the moneys are put up by the province and 25% by the municipalities. There is nothing new. I think that is the story with this government. There is nothing new.

Mr Jackson: I wish as well to rise to discuss the minister's statement. The minister will be aware that I wrote to him in early January on behalf of the VON in Hamilton-Wentworth and on behalf of Hamilton-Wentworth region. They had a basic question: When is this government going to announce whether it is going to extend the program? We are talking about senior citizens who are currently in apartment settings on a home share basis, and they were being warned, "Potentially you may have to vacate because the government won't give us a straight answer."

The minister knows that, because it was set out to him in a letter. In fact, the funding for this program expired on 31 March and this government had to run around and put its finger in a bunch of dikes that were splitting open because programs were collapsing. Some regions were saying, "If you're not getting the money from the province, you don't need the money from us," and they are not budgeted.

This minister is also the Minister of Municipal Affairs. He should know better than to hang out municipalities and their budgeting process by taking three and a half months to get something as simple as this approved by his cabinet. We are talking about no new dollars. We are talking about extending it one year. That is the extent of the commitment that we have in front of us.

1400

More important, there are those senior citizens who had to be warned that their tenancy agreements may not extend beyond 31 March. There are laws in this province under the Landlord and Tenant Act requiring notice. This Minister of Housing has flagrantly abused those principles in law because it is obvious that in Ontario tenants are protected under the law from a variety of people, but those senior citizens who were using this program certainly were not being protected by this Minister of Housing.

There is no protection from politicians who make late announcements like this and leave these programs potentially in jeopardy. The minister has extended this program for only one year, and it is not fair to the seniors, to the

delivery agencies and, most of all, to the municipalities that are struggling to balance their budgets this year. Three and a half months late announcements from this minister are not helping the province plan for the future for the people of this province.

ORAL QUESTIONS

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Premier having to do with the government's agreement with the Ontario Medical Association.

As the incredibly effective investigative journalism of the Toronto Star brings forward details of this agreement day by day, I am almost tempted to recall the days when it was called the "Red Star" in the previous administration when there were those unkind enough to think that some of their more effective investigative journalism was assisted by the then Premier's spin doctors. I do not believe it happened then any more than I believe it is happening now. I see the principal spin doctor has gone out for a drink of water, for a spin.

According to the Toronto Star there are now further details of this agreement which will not be ratified, as far as we know, until about 8 May, when the members of the OMA have an opportunity to meet together with their executive and give the agreement their careful consideration. Is the Premier going to refer this question to the Minister of Health? I would be glad to put it to her.

Hon Mr Rae: Yes.

Mr Nixon: I will certainly do that. When I asked her yesterday, she felt inadequate to handle that matter and she gave it to the Premier. It is very difficult to follow the bouncing ball over there. Whoever chooses to answer the question is all right with me.

Are we now to gather that the long-sought arbitration has been granted, according to reports in the media; that the Rand formula closed shop, which I know would be difficult for the NDP to consider, has also been granted; that we have now what amounts to a 2% plus 2% plus 3.95%, a magic number that only a spin doctor could come up with, amounting to an increase of just under 8%? Can the Minister of Health indicate whether or not we in the Legislature—representing the taxpayers as only we can with only 62% of them supporting us—could perhaps know some of the details in these matters so that the money involved could be a matter of some substantial discussion, and other attributes of the negotiations which might be valuable to all concerned?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Leader of the Opposition understands that the OMA team, which negotiated with our representatives for three months on this tentative contract, now wishes to take that proposal to its membership and we feel it is legitimate that the OMA should have an opportunity to talk to its membership about that proposal before we disclose to other members of the public what the nature of the proposal is. In the fullness of time, and it looks to be about 4 May, the OMA will be able to have a sense of its executive council's response on this matter. By then we

should be able to discuss exactly what is involved in the proposal.

Mr Nixon: The honourable minister is treating this as if it were a labour negotiation and that, of course, would be her wont; she would understand that. From our point of view, we feel there are two parties to the negotiation and, while the minister and the Premier and their colleagues might very well be one, we really insist on being part of that as well.

Yesterday when there was a rumour of a 2% plus 2% plus 2% settlement, I said the cost might very well be as much as \$400 million. There is every indication it will be about \$380 million.

Far from having gone without an increase during the last two years, which the Toronto Star indicates, the doctors went without a change in their schedule, which is true. The actual utilization increase in transference from the consolidated revenue fund was substantial, amounting to well over 7% with an indication of a further 14% this year. The idea that the doctors unfortunately have gone without suitable remuneration is really something that should be discussed here. We are not fighting with the doctors. We have had fights with them in the past. But surely it is important that the House be informed of these matters as they become public.

Would the minister not agree that it becomes irresponsible of her and the Premier and those associated with these negotiations to treat this like an ordinary labour negotiation, and they should instead recognize that this involves a \$5-billion expenditure on behalf of the taxpayers of the province to pay for the services of the medical practitioners? This matter cannot be postponed, cannot be put off for another couple of weeks at the convenience of the minister. In fact the details should be put before the House without delay.

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that the information about the proposal should be put before this Legislature as it becomes public, and that is an entirely reasonable proposal. As the OMA takes a few days to inform its membership about the nature of the proposal, we are content on this side to wait. We will be very happy to share full information about that proposal if in fact it becomes a real proposal through the endorsement of the membership of the Ontario Medical Association.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, you are aware that the minister, particularly over the weekend, took the occasion during interviews with the media to indicate her view that this was a tremendous breakthrough and a new period of understanding and usefulness between the government and the people and the medical practitioners. We sincerely hope that is the case. We really do.

The last time we had that sort of an understanding was when Larry Grossman gave them an 11%-a-year increase. It was actually just like Chamberlain coming back from Munich. He certainly had peace in his time. I want to simply indicate to the minister our concern particularly with her own attitude in this regard. She says that it is great. There is a quote as follows that I think is interesting:

physicians will be included "in future talks aimed at finding new ways of controlling costs."

Would it not seem appropriate, particularly for this minister and her colleagues, to make it clear that other aspects of those providing medical services would also be included? Not only the nurses, but those having positions of responsibility for hospital boards and many others who are part of our overall medical program. There are those in the past who have felt that perhaps the doctors should have had more to say about the matter. But I believe the minister and myself and others feel that all of these people providing services should be included and not excluded, as seems to be the aim of the minister in her recent pronouncements. Can she indicate how she is going to deal with this particular matter?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Leader of the Opposition is putting it exactly right. This government believes that all those involved in the provision of health care services, and there are 300,000 people in Ontario involved in the provision of health care services, should in fact be involved in discussion about the shape of our health care system.

We also very strongly believe that the public deserves to be involved and that the public deserves an accountability which we very much hope the proposal now before the Ontario Medical Association will in fact provide. We look upon it as a very important proposal for the very reason that for the first time the medical profession in Ontario, we hope, will be involved with the government of Ontario in determining the most effective and the most cost-effective kinds of health care delivery programs for this province.

All in all, what I have attempted to do over the last few days is to give a message to the public and to the physicians of this province that this government feels very optimistic and very positive about the negotiations that we have had, that the contract, we hope, is one that the physicians of Ontario will support. We hope very much to be able to report to this Legislature early in May and to share a good contract and the details of that contract with members of this Legislature.

1410

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Scott: I have a question for the Premier. My friend will be interested to hear that I am getting a lot of letters from alternative provincial representatives from various ridings excoriating my questions, but my question today again is for the Premier.

For a long time, he has been in favour of divestment for all his cabinet colleagues and parliamentary assistants, and I believe his party is on record in favour of that. With the kind of righteous unctious that the TV audience is getting used to, on 12 December he announced his new conflict-of-interest guidelines, of which divestment was a major feature. He was coming to the legislative committee to discuss them and, just before his attendance there, he extended the time limit for divestment so nothing practical could be asked of him.

But the time for divestment has now gone by, and on 2 April the Premier issued a press release that indicated that three parliamentary assistants had been exempted from di-

vestment. It said: "All ministers have met the guidelines as set out on 12 December 1990 and on 18 February 1991." I would like to ask the Premier what impression he hoped that press release would create in the minds of the media and the public.

Hon Mr Rae: I think I will wait for the supplementary question. I can only say that I look forward to the supplementary.

Mr Scott: The Premier, as is often the case, is not only righteously unctuous, but he has his wits about him. He was very smart to take that position because there is increasing evidence that his divestment guidelines—I would not say yet that they should be judged a PR scam—have not been complied with.

As honourable members will know—we remember the ringing tones of the statement—they required divestment by ministers and parliamentary assistants of all business interests and assets which could appear to cause a conflict of interest and the minister on 2 April said all ministers had complied with that. It has come to our attention that a number of ministers who declared such commercial properties from which they were obtaining income in their statements to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner have not divested themselves. We have only been able to search title with respect to two of them, as of yesterday, and I want to ask the Premier if he is aware that the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Minister of Citizenship, the only two with whom I can deal now, have not in fact divested as the guidelines require.

Hon Mr Rae: I will have to take the question as notice, obviously, but I would say to the member for St George-St David that it was my understanding at the time I issued the press release that the information contained therein was correct. If I find that information was not entirely correct, obviously I personally will take full responsibility for that, because if there has been a mistake in fact in terms of the compliance—I would just say this: All the information that the member is referring to is, as he will know, publicly available in the reports that have been filed with the commissioner and that are available downstairs.

Mr Scott: Divestments are not.

Hon Mr Rae: No, but I would say to the member that this information is publicly available. If there are any questions arising from the member's question, obviously I will have to look into it and get back to him as soon as possible.

Mr Scott: I understand that the Premier would want to take this as notice. I am grateful that he is going to look into it. I hope he will not restrict himself simply to the two ministers, because—what do we call them?—the minions of the Leader of the Opposition have been working hard searching titles, and we only have the titles with respect to the two ministers. There is evidence that some other ministers, whom I would not name in these circumstances, may not have divested as well.

I want to make the point to the Premier that one of the criticisms made of his scheme was that he was going to be the judge and jury of divestment, which is not a matter of public record. I ask him to be judge, jury and executioner. I want to know precisely, did two ministers or their

representatives confirm to the Premier that they had made the divestment required by the statute? I think we are entitled to a yes or no on that. Who did the Premier speak to before he issued this press release that all ministers have met the guidelines?

Hon Mr Rae: Whatever record I had for unctuousness in opposition, it is obviously being surpassed by the member for St George-St David. I would say directly to the member for St George-St David that, again, I am sure he would want to be fair and entirely accurate with respect to the public record. To my knowledge, there were two statements issued by me. One was the statement I made in the House. The other was—

Mr Scott: Right here.

Hon Mr Rae: No, that is a third one.

Mr Scott: So we should ignore this?

Hon Mr Rae: No, I am not suggesting the member should ignore anything. I want to try to provide as clear an answer as I can, and I will be glad to answer the question in full tomorrow. But I would say to him that in addition to the statement I made in December, I made a statement in February, at which time we clarified the requirement with respect to divestment, with respect to real property.

Mr Scott: We asked your office for the guidelines today. They are the same guidelines.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Would the Premier just sit down. I suppose that many of us recall the age-old practice of addressing the questions to the Speaker and addressing the responses to the Speaker. That is a practice to which I think it would be nice to return.

Hon Mr Rae: I want to make one thing very clear in my answer to the member for St George-St David. I will endeavour to make a statement to the House tomorrow, if that is possible. I have a speaking engagement at noon, but I will try to be back in time for that. If I am not, I will certainly make a statement as soon as humanly possible.

I want to make it very clear to him that the ministers have been very clear with respect to their statements. They have gone through with Judge Evans, as have all members. If there has been a mistake made with respect to compliance with my guidelines as they were released in December and again in February, the mistake lies with me. I will be glad to share whatever information I have with the member.

1420

ALGOMA CENTRAL RAILWAY

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. On 17 December 1990 the Premier's government awarded \$5 million to the Algoma Central Railway in Sault Ste Marie. At that time the president of Algoma Central Corp, which owns the railway, said that as far as the railway knows, the \$5 million was a grant, adding, "We have not been told of any strings attached." Can the Premier tell me today whether there were or are in fact any conditions attached to his government's decision to give Algoma Central this money.

Hon Mr Rae: I think I will pass that question to the Minister of Northern Development.

Hon Miss Martel: I am pleased to respond to the question raised by the leader of the third party. The \$5 million that was given to ACR last year came from the Northern Ontario Heritage Fund Corp. It was authorized by the board in order to deal with a particular problem that had been raised with us, that it had to continue with the railway.

At the same point in time, we also made it clear to ACR that we were interested very much in entering into negotiations with ACR with respect to its future and ours, and the future of tourism in Sault Ste Marie and the future of Wawa, so there are discussions that have just commenced with ACR. They have been held up in some ways because of what is happening in Sault Ste Marie right now, and the outcome of what is going on at Algoma Steel, but I can assure the leader of the third party that, very much, there were letters that went back and forth with respect to our interest, as a province, in entering into negotiations with respect to the future of that particular company and the province's role in it.

Mr Harris: Clearly the understanding that Algoma Central had—and from the minister's press release there is no indication otherwise and from what she has just told me no indication otherwise—was that there were no strings attached to the \$5 million that was given.

I am in possession of what appear to be the minutes of the cabinet meeting of 14 November. According to these minutes, cabinet approved not only the initial \$5 million; it approved up to \$15 million in aid for three years. I quote from this cabinet document that says "in exchange for assets in the form of land, rail line and equipment and with the option to acquire all remaining ACR assets after 1993." In other words, those were the conditions that cabinet set down for flowing the money to Algoma Central. In other words, some six weeks after being sworn into office, the NDP government approved taxpayers' money to secretly purchase part of this publicly traded company, with an option to purchase the whole railway after 1993. Those were the conditions, according to this cabinet document.

Given the serious implication of using tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money to buy the company, how can the minister possibly defend concealing this information from the people of Ontario, when the initial \$5 million down payment announcement was made on 17 December?

Hon Miss Martel: It is my understanding, in conjunction with the press release, that it also said clearly that ongoing negotiations would be going on with the company with respect to its future and ours. When the member for Algoma and my colleague the member for Sault Ste Marie made the announcement on my behalf in Sault Ste Marie, it was my understanding they made that very clear, that there would be ongoing negotiations with ACR with respect to its future and ours, and how we as a province could ensure that both for Wawa and Sault Ste Marie, the jobs with respect to the tour train could be continued in the future.

I do not think there was anything secret that was done. I think he made it very clear that we were entering into negotiations. I am not prepared today to outline the details of those or in fact the negotiating position that the province is going to take, but I can tell the leader of the third party that we made it very clear that there were going to be ongoing negotiations with respect to our future and theirs.

Mr Harris: The cabinet documents are very clear. They state that Ontario's NDP government has agreed to provide up to \$15 million in financial assistance to the ACR, conditional—it says “conditional.” This is a condition that cabinet set down for flowing the money, “That ACC accept the transfer of assets in the form of rail line, equipment and land to the province in exchange for financial assistance over the period 1990 to 1993.” Further, the document states this condition, “That ACC grant the province, with ONTC as operating agent, an option to acquire the remaining rail line operations, including all land and assets for an amount to be negotiated.”

Now my question is equally clear, as the cabinet documents are clear: If the government is so bent on purchasing a financially troubled company with taxpayers' money, does the minister not think that taxpayers have a right to know about this? Why was this information of the strings that clearly were attached not made public when the \$5-million grant was made and the announcement was made on 17 December?

Hon Miss Martel: My colleagues made it very clear when the announcements were made that we were entering into negotiations with ACR determining our position, our future and its future as well. We made it very clear that there were ongoing discussions with respect to this money and both their and our futures. I am not prepared today, nor would I have been prepared in December, to outline what may happen in the end and what our position as a government was going to be in those negotiations. I was not prepared to do that then; I am not now. Those negotiations will continue and when they come to an end and we have a final position, we will let this House and the public know.

Mr Harris: Clearly the cabinet authorization does not allow a cent to go unless those conditions are met, so obviously all those conditions were met, or the minister flowed the \$5 million without them, which she has no authorization to do, according to this cabinet document.

Mr Harris: For my second question, I would like to go back to the Premier, because the second aspect to the closed-door deal has major, province-wide environmental implications as well.

Two weeks ago the NDP killed a proposal to recycle and dispose of Metro's waste in northern Ontario and it called the plan “unthinkable.” Last week, in yet another NDP flip-flop, the government approved the unthinkable for Kingston waste going to Ottawa. Can the Premier confirm today that as part of the Algoma Central Railway deal his cabinet actually approved yet another plan behind closed doors, and that it is a condition of this deal that he investigate sending southern Ontario waste to northern Ontario for recycling and disposal?

Hon Mr Rae: I can only say to the member who has asked the question that I have no reason to believe this is true. I do not know what foundation he has for that assertion. I do not know what basis he has for the allegation. I have absolutely no recollection of any such conversations and I certainly have no recollection of any such decision.

Mr Harris: Then I can understand the Premier being confused about the garbage and what he has agreed to and what he has not. We have all heard the contradictions that are coming out from the minister and from the government, so to help clarify, I will read from his own cabinet document what the cabinet approved on 14 November:

“The province, with the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology as lead, will (a) facilitate discussions with Dofasco, ACC and Algoma Steel Corp to determine if an agreement could be reached whereby Dofasco mill waste from southern Ontario could be shipped, in part, to the Algoma Ore division operations in Wawa for recycling and, in part, to northern Ontario for disposal.”

That is what the cabinet approved, according to these documents, on 14 November. Can the Premier tell this House today how his secret plans on shipping southern Ontario waste to northern Ontario in this instance are proceeding?

Hon Mr Rae: Again, I will obviously take the question as notice. The member is referring to an alleged—

Mr Sorbara: It is the Premier's cabinet's document.

Hon Mr Rae: The member says he is referring to a cabinet document. I have not seen the document that he says he has and obviously I will have to look into that particular document. I would only say, to elaborate a bit, that the future of Wawa, the future of the Sault and the future of the railway were of concern to us in the fall, as they are today, and that was the nature of the negotiations that we authorized in our discussions. But obviously I will have to look at the document the member is referring to.

Mr Harris: It is becoming more and more clear the government says one thing in public and then it does another behind closed doors. First it is yes, then it is no. First it is ship to the north, then do not ship; burn, then it is do not burn. Now it is send waste from Kingston to Ottawa.

Now we find out there is a secret plan in the works approved on 14 November by cabinet to ship southern mill waste to northern Ontario. The only garbage that is piling up faster than Metropolitan Toronto's landfill sites is the garbage that is coming from the Premier and his ministers day after day in and beyond the chamber.

1430

The cabinet documents indicate one of the cons of this deal, one of the downsides, that an environmental assessment may be required as a result of cabinet's ACR mill waste decision. Surely the Premier would agree with me that we are dealing with serious business. Listen, the proposal may even make sense, but if he is not going to tell us what he is doing, how can we judge that?

Can the Premier tell me why he and the cabinet concealed this important information when they went ahead with the first stage of the \$15 million; that is, on 17 December he announced the \$5 million according to the recommendations

and the approvals of the cabinet, including this one to ship the waste from Hamilton to Wawa?

Hon Mr Rae: The difficulty I am having, and I want to be fair to the leader of the third party, is that when he asked his first question to me, because he asked it in the context of Kirkland Lake and he asked it in the context of Ottawa and Kingston, I assumed he was talking about municipal garbage. I had assumed that was the nature of the question and I honestly believed that, when he asked that question, that is what he was talking about.

He then turns to say that he is talking about a situation with respect to Dofasco, which is a company that owns a steel mill in Hamilton. It is the company that also owns Algoma Steel in Sault Ste Marie and the iron ore mine in Wawa. I do not want to be too argumentative, but I want to suggest to the leader of the third party that there is a slight difference in the question and a slight difference in the subject in terms of what he is talking about.

Second, with respect to the issue which he is talking about, which is so-called secrecy, I want to say this to the honourable member: Obviously in an issue of this kind, in which there are commercial negotiations between the government of the province and a company with respect to the future of the company, those negotiations have to be handled with some discretion if they are to be successful.

The press release makes it clear that there was a grant from the Northern Ontario Development Corp and then, in addition, that there were further negotiations that would be taking place. I do not think that one could possibly have negotiations taking place on any other basis than in a degree of confidence. I am sorry if the leader is shaking his head and disagrees. I do not honestly know how the government of the province could possibly conduct any form of commercial negotiation with a private company unless it was done on that basis.

GERALD CAPLAN

Mr Offer: I have a question of the Premier. As he knows, there has been speculation circulating around this Legislature for weeks that a close friend of his, a former principal secretary to the leader of the Ontario NDP, a former national director of the NDP, a representative of the NDP on numerous media panels and a member of the NDP election campaign and the government transition team, is now lobbying on behalf of major corporate interests. I recognize that the Premier cannot control any one particular person, but I ask him whether he will allow his ministers and in fact himself to be lobbied by Mr Caplan for these various private interests.

Hon Mr Rae: As I understand it, Mr Caplan is a consultant who gives advice to private companies on a range of issues with respect to public policy. Now if the member has any evidence, if he has the slightest evidence to suggest that Mr Caplan has acted improperly with respect to any of the clients he may have of which I am not aware, if he is aware of any special access which either these companies or Mr Caplan has, then I would suggest to the member that he state his case, state the facts, put them before the House and let us look at them.

If all the member is saying is that Mr Caplan is giving advice to Bombardier and other companies with respect to their public policy in this province and in other provinces, I can only say that we try to do business in this province by the book. That is the way we do things. The Bombardier process, the negotiations between Ontario and Quebec and the establishment of the interprovincial committee were carried out by the member's predecessor government, by my predecessor, Mr Peterson. As I say, if the member has any knowledge of any untoward access or influence, he should please let me know what it is.

Mr Offer: I am absolutely surprised by the Premier's response because that question, as I indicated earlier, is not about any one particular individual. Rather this is a question about personal standards, about the Premier's standards, standards that he has set for himself and his party, where he has stood on a pedestal. I read from the Premier's particular statement of 12 December:

"I consider it essential to establish certain fundamental principles. It is to be our governing principle that we must at all times act in a manner that will not only bear the closest public scrutiny but will go further and ensure public confidence and trust in the integrity of government."

Will the Premier ensure that there is some public record, as there is in Ottawa, of all lobbying activities undertaken by Mr Caplan with members of his cabinet and with himself on behalf of these private corporate interests?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me say to the member in regard to the question of this issue with respect to dealing with so-called lobbyists of all kinds and consultants of all kinds from all parties—and one could go through lists, members who are Conservatives, members who are Liberals, former members who are actively involved—that this matter has been referred, along with other matters with respect to conflict of interest, to the parliamentary committee. I look forward to hearing directly from the parliamentary committee in that regard. It is obviously something the government will look at if in the wisdom of the parliamentary committee it is decided that that is the wisest possible course.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE FOR THE DISABLED

Mrs Marland: My question is for the minister responsible for disability issues. In response to a questionnaire from the Trans-Action coalition during last summer's election campaign, the NDP said:

"New Democrats know that accessible transportation is the only way for persons with disabilities to have equal access to employment, education and recreational activities, and this accessibility can only come from concrete action being taken to achieve accessibility."

I emphasize "concrete action."

On 19 June 1990, Rebecca Noble, a blind woman, was tragically killed when she fell off the Lawrence West subway platform and was struck by a train. A few days before her death, a coroner's inquest into another TTC death had recommended, "That a program be implemented immediately to install a clearly delineated yellow safety strip in each station across the system."

Can the minister tell the House how many TTC stations have been fitted with these platform-edge markers and what progress has been made with respect to other measures to make the TTC safer for blind persons, such as uniform train lengths, relocating obstacles like garbage cans and extending handrails at the top of stairways?

Hon Ms Ziembra: I thank the member for the question. I would like to refer it to the Minister of Transportation.

Hon Mr Philip: We have told the TTC that we endorse the TTC's choices for the future. The TTC is working on an elaborate plan of access. My ministry is also working with municipalities and the Ontario Urban Transit Association towards an effective, efficient and financially responsible manner of making all transportation in this province accessible. GO Transit has been asked by me to develop an action plan in terms of new and key rail stations, bus and taxi and elevator access. We are developing a number of plans and I will be making the announcement in the House in the not-too-distant future on a lot of details concerning some of these plans.

1440

Mrs Marland: We have just experienced a real copout. The minister to whom I directed my question is responsible for people with disabilities. I could have asked the question to the Minister of Transportation had I wished. We might as well do away with an advocate or a ministry for disabled people if she is going to refer questions to another minister.

I think this is a real copout today and I would like to say that even from the referral we still did not get an answer. I did not ask about GO Transit; I asked about the TTC. I asked a very simple question: How many of those stations are now equipped? Perhaps I can help the minister and tell him that there is only one out of 65 stations under the Toronto Transit Commission that is equipped.

If the conventional transit system of subways and buses is not sufficiently safe and accessible, then blind persons require alternative means of transportation. This is where it leaves his ministry incidentally and should be with the minister whom I addressed my initial question to. Perhaps he might have this answer since he did not have the other one. Can he tell this House why Wheel-Trans, Toronto's parallel transit service for disabled persons, will not provide rides for blind persons and what steps he would take to ensure that blind persons have access to parallel transportation systems? Perhaps an integration with accessible taxis? Now this is going to be really great, to get this answer from this minister.

Hon Mr Philip: The minister responsible for disability issues has never copped out of any answers. She referred the question to me because she knew that I was working with the TTC, which is responsible for developing these programs. I am sorry that the member did not want to know about all of the great programs that we are developing throughout the transit system. I notice that she did not want to know about the new Peel transit system, in her riding, which is accessible to the disabled people in her riding. She does not want to hear about that. We will be happy to tell her about it any time that she wants to ask

either me or the minister responsible for disability issues. Both of us will give her the answers.

The Speaker: New question. The member for Durham West.

Mr Wiseman: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please. The high level of interest in the chamber this afternoon is certainly appreciated. The member for Durham West is waiting patiently to place—

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, the disabled people of Ontario are shortchanged today.

The Speaker: The member for Mississauga South, I am sure, would like the member for Durham West to have an opportunity to place a question, as she was given an opportunity. Just one moment.

GERALD CAPLAN

Mr Offer: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In an earlier question that I had raised with the Premier, the Premier alluded to the question of lobbyists being referred to a parliamentary committee. We are unaware of that particular aspect and I am wondering if the Premier, if not today then certainly later on, might be able to express exactly which committee that particular question has been referred to.

The Speaker: I appreciate the interest. It is not a point of order, as the member may know. He may wish to consult with the Clerk's office to determine which committee sees to that matter. The member for Durham West.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Wiseman: For the third time, my question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Over the last few days we have been subjected through a local newspaper to articles concerning the welfare system. We have seen welfare headlines such as "Welfare Madness." We have had "Pitfalls of Welfare System" articles written by Diane Francis concerning the welfare system. In these articles she has made some very serious allegations about the level of services available by the welfare system, making comments that it is valued at \$45,000 a year and that people who do not live on welfare should quit their jobs and go on welfare. I would like to have some comments and responses to the accusations made by this reporter.

Hon Ms Akande: Actually, I think what is evident from the news coverage is that the writer of those articles is sadly in need of a research assistant. The information concerning social assistance and the rates that are available are certainly open to everyone and that information would be available to her. Recognizing that, one would notice there is a great inaccuracy. One of the things quoted in that article is that a family of four would be getting \$45,000. Anyone who would research the information to which I have referred would recognize that this is grossly untrue, that the maximum would be around \$22,000 in equivalency and hardly sufficient to raise a family of four.

Mr Wiseman: I have a supplementary question.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat. I enjoy a lively crowd as much as anyone but, at the same time, I am attempting to hear the member.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I am sure there is a member towards the end of the chamber who does not wish to be identified at this point. The member for Durham West.

Mr Wiseman: I am just wondering if it is possible that the federal grants which the recipients are receiving are being piggybacked on top of the Ontario welfare system and the municipal welfare system so that these kinds of numbers are possible.

Hon Ms Akande: I see no such indications of generosity from this federal government. As a matter of fact, they have consistently pulled out in social assistance from the position they previously had held, and of course there is no piggyback on grants. Who among you would deny a mere sustenance to the people who are required to live on social assistance? Who among you would do that? Therefore, no. No, in fact there is no such program.

1450

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr Chiarelli: My question is to the Minister of the Environment concerning the question of transportation of garbage. With this issue, this minister has clearly demonstrated that she is the most inconsistent and policy-bereft minister on the government benches.

Last month I introduced legislation that would provide a province-wide framework for municipalities either to prohibit or control the importation of garbage. When I introduced this bill to help Ottawa-Carleton and other municipalities across the province, the minister dismissed it outright, stating, "It is not appropriate for each municipality in Ontario to pass bylaws on how garbage is disposed." She went further to say that she favours "legislation that would cover waste disposal for all municipalities, not just for those in a crunch, like Ottawa-Carleton." That is exactly what my bill does.

The minister has now done a complete flip-flop, an about-face, and has made a commitment to introduce legislation specific to the region of Ottawa-Carleton allowing this one municipality some measure of control over importation of garbage to help settle a lawsuit.

Will the minister bring forward legislation that will provide full control to all municipalities in Ontario so we can have a province-wide policy on the shipping of waste and not simply emergency, ad hoc reaction?

Hon Mrs Grier: I wish we never had emergencies. I wish that when I became Minister of the Environment I had found in place a long-term policy and strategy that would have dealt with municipal solid waste on a province-wide basis. Unfortunately, that was not what I found, but what I have done is put in place the foundations for a long-term province-wide strategy.

I regret that the members of the opposition seem unable to make the distinction between planning for the long term and a policy that involves reducing garbage and find-

ing sites close to the source of generation, and short-term solutions that must be taken in emergencies.

The people of Ontario understand. The people who have phoned and written to me understand that what this government is doing is putting in place a strategy and a policy and a program that will avoid emergencies in the future.

Mr Sorbara: The difficulty with what the Minister of the Environment is doing during these seven months she has been minister is that every time she gets on her feet, she loses credibility. She just stood up in the House and said that in the case of Ottawa-Carleton she is dealing with an emergency measure, and yet she and her ministry have just entered into an agreement with the region of Ottawa-Carleton in which she undertakes to introduce legislation in this House giving the region of Ottawa-Carleton special powers to control the dumping of garbage in the municipality.

Those special powers are not going to be available to Kirkland Lake, those special powers are not going to be available to Metropolitan Toronto, and most particularly they are not going to be available to the region of York. A few days ago she stood up in this House and said that she, in her own wisdom, had determined that York region would be the recipient of all of Metropolitan Toronto's garbage, without any study, without any environmental assessment, and she said that would be the case because her program would drive Metropolitan Toronto to become more active in the 3Rs; that is, reduce, reuse and recycle. The fact is that nothing has changed. Metropolitan Toronto has been dumping its garbage into York region for the past 30 years. So why is this a new policy?

My question to the minister is quite simple. If she is prepared to introduce legislation in this House giving special powers to the region of Ottawa-Carleton, will she at the same time introduce a bill in this House giving those very same powers to the region of York, yes or no?

Hon Mrs Grier: The recommendations and the agreements that were struck to which the member referred and implied was an agreement in negotiation with my ministry. In negotiations between the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton and Laidlaw Waste Systems, an agreement was struck. We brought those parties together to assist in the negotiations and avoid a lawsuit. As part of that negotiation, we agreed to introduce legislation, not as the member has described it, to give special powers to Ottawa-Carleton to prohibit the importation of waste, but on the contrary, to give to the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton exactly the same powers that exist in the legislation of other regional municipalities; in other words, the power to impose a surtax on municipalities from without their boundary to dispose of waste within their boundary. There is no inconsistency.

SOCIAL WORK

Mr Jackson: I have a question for the Premier. The Premier will be aware that Ontario is the only province in Canada that does not have a regulated social workers act. The Premier should also be aware that I stood in this House on 21 March and advised all members of the case of a convicted child molester who was opening a child

care and counselling service in Kitchener-Waterloo. I have already expressed shock and dismay to the Premier and to his government, that this single action alone should be grounds on which his government should be moving in order to ensure that there be a regulation of the practices of social work, and that it is a timely and absolute necessity for this province.

The Premier indicated in a letter dated 5 June 1989, while he was in opposition, that he had concern for the failure of the then government to act promptly. Would the Premier please indicate if he is still personally committed to the words he said in his 5 June 1989 letter.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me say first of all to the member that I am familiar with the Kitchener situation which he has described, and I think anybody would share his view as to the very real problem that refers to. I would say to the honourable member that I do not think it is clear in my mind that there is any connection between the desire for a professional social work act and the particular problem he is referring to.

Since the member has referred the question directly to me, I will answer it as directly as I can, just to say to him that obviously this is something the ministry continues to look at. There are a number of interests that have to be reconciled. I know there are those who felt that it would have been better or it would have been appropriate if the act had gone ahead with the health professions legislation review. It was the view of the government that this was not the appropriate way to deal with it, and all I can say to the member is that it is something that continues to be under review.

Mr Jackson: I am shocked to learn that the Premier does not make any kind of linkage between the case I raised in Kitchener-Waterloo and the need for a regulated social workers act in this province.

I would like to further remind the Premier of another letter that he wrote on 27 August 1987 where he says: "New Democrats are fighting to protect Ontario's consumers of human services. This is an important way to prevent adverse physical, psychological and social consequences for Ontario consumers."

In the Premier's own letter he has described the kinds of circumstances that those children are probably going to be going through in Kitchener. Before the last election, he could clearly see the linkage for the need to protect citizens of this province. Now as Premier he does not. I am asking him again: Is he committed to bringing in a social workers act with regulations for the protection of human services for the people who require them, or is this just one more example of a betrayal of his conscience on these important human service matters in this province?

Hon Mr Rae: I will try not to be as provocative in my answer as the member was in his question. I will simply try to answer him as directly as I can and say to him that the question of a separate social work act is something that is under review within the government. It is something about which we continue to conduct consultations and discuss with a variety of groups, the question of what is the best and most effective way to proceed. I hope the member

would realize that there are a number of ways that one can do it, and obviously we are looking at it. I would repeat my point to him—

Mr Jackson: Would this be in your social contract with the Constitution?

Hon Mr Rae: I would repeat my point to the member, if he will simply allow me to answer, which is to say that the particular example of somebody offering himself up as a potential provider of child care in Kitchener, with respect, is a very different question from this particular one. I would say to the member that perhaps he should reflect on that and reflect on the fact that there are differing views on this.

1500

The Speaker: The member for Durham East.

Some hon members: Karen, Karen.

Interjections.

Mr Mills: My question is for the Minister of Education.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I realize that the member for Perth is quite popular which is, I am quite sure, quite gratifying to the member for Perth. However, she has not been recognized for her question.

Interjections.

The Speaker: To your disappointment, I do recognize the member for Durham East.

EDUCATION FINANCING

Mr Mills: My question this afternoon is for the Minister of Education. In my riding, the people are starting to get their tax bills and they are getting a little bit testy. They want to know how we are moving towards 60%, towards the education—

Interjections.

Mr Mills: What is the minister doing about it?

Hon Mrs Boyd: I thank the member for the question. There are taxpayers all over Ontario who are concerned about this issue and I would repeat to the member, as I have in this House before, and to all the trustees' groups that I talk to and the citizens' groups that I talk to, that we see this as a very serious issue. Our party remains committed to our pledge to remove the major cost of education from the regressive property tax base, move it much more on to the basis of ability to pay. That is the purpose of the education part of the Fair Tax Commission and the review of education financing that will go on through my ministry. That commitment absolutely remains.

The Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired. Interjections.

The Speaker: One at a time. I cannot—

Mr Daigeler: I would like to move unanimous consent, seeing that the opposition on the government's side is so strong to muzzle the member for Perth, that we all agree

to give her a chance to ask her question and to show that we on the opposition side are so generous.

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mrs Haslam: I originally rose on a point of information, Mr Speaker, to let the members of the gallery know that I was third on the list again, so I do appreciate their allowing me this opportunity. I will continue to fight to be first, second and third on this list at all times.

My question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I have met recently on the weekend with a number of farmers' groups in my riding. I meet with them quite often. They are concerned, as the Hayes report does show, with long-term debt relief. I would like to ask the minister how he intends to move on this particular issue for long-term debt.

Hon Mr Buchanan: Just let me say how pleased I am that the opposition has seen fit to give the member an opportunity to ask her question. It is nice to see that Agriculture and Food is getting a sense of priority in this House.

The member is asking about long-term financing. We have responded to the short-term credit needs, interest needs, of farmers with a program we announced a week ago. We would like very much to have a long-term interest program in place, and that is one of the very first objectives of this government.

It was unfortunate that we could not respond this month or this year, but we are working on it. I have a group in the ministry working on long-term finance. We hope to have a program we can test out with the farmers and farm leaders over the summer and fall and have that long-term interest program in place for the coming year.

Mrs Haslam: I was going to do what the opposition usually does. I was going to give a long background about rural issues in my riding, then I was going to read from the National Farmers' Union about short-term solutions to the farm crisis, long-term financial requirements for family farms and then I was going to get into more of what the government was doing so that I could finally get to my question and say: If long-term debt relief was a long-term goal for us, why did we bring in the \$50-million short-term program?

Hon Mr Buchanan: One of the things is that we certainly wanted to respond to the needs out there, and long-term finance is probably the second most urgent need in the farm community. It requires some thought. We are looking at putting some new initiatives in place; we are looking to have farmers in rural communities reinvest dollars from that area in their own communities. It will take a little bit of time to put a structure in place that will serve the needs of the agricultural and rural communities of Ontario. That took a little longer than we had expected, and that is why we went ahead with the short-term interest program in the meantime until we got the long-term program ready.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT (ELECTORAL QUOTIENTS), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ÉDUCATION (QUOTIENTS ÉLECTORAUX)

Mr Tilson moved first reading of Bill 72, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to Electoral Quotients.

M. Tilson propose la première lecture du projet de loi 72, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux quotients électoraux.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

1510

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Resuming the adjourned debate on government notice of motion number 16 on time allocation in relation to Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Mr Tilson: Yesterday, I had started to make some comments with respect to a press conference that was held this past week by the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association, talking about the housing crisis in the province of Ontario. Obviously I assumed the whole purpose of Bill 4 is to deal with the housing crisis or get a start in dealing with the housing crisis.

I think it has become apparent to us more and more that Bill 4 is not addressing that problem. We had hoped, certainly on this side, to raise more issues with respect to the whole presentation of Bill 4 and how we would hope to solve the housing crisis and offer suggestions through amendments. I had hoped that perhaps members from the government would offer further amendments too as time went on. That is one item I would like to emphasize before I get into the topic raised by the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association.

It is regrettable that the government House leader did not argue or did not put forth in her motion a provision that would allow for new amendments that have been put forward since the committee introduced its report to the House. There have been two new amendments which have been filed, and those were filed by the member for Carleton. I hope the House leader would agree that if she had been at all concerned with a fair hearing, she would have drafted her motion to give amendments equal time within the allocated time. That has not been done.

The amendments that have been put forward by the member for Carleton are to a later section, and clearly the member for Carleton will be denied any opportunity to put forward his case on these amendments. The intent of the closure motion is to shut down debate and clearly appears to be ignoring any subject of fairness with respect to this legislation. I also emphasize that hopefully, as the debate proceeds, there could conceivably be new amendments that might even be raised by members of the government

or by members of either opposition party with respect to this bill. If this motion proceeds and is successful, all members of the House will be denied that opportunity. That is unfortunate, considering the effect of this legislation on the economy of this province.

Last week there was a press conference held by the Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association and the association produced a press release. Together with the Co-Operative Housing Association of Ontario, they produced a report which talked about the rental crisis in housing in the province of Ontario.

They pointed out that tenant income has failed to keep pace with rent increases in the past decade and that is what the study shows. They talk about real rents after inflation having risen 11% to 18% in major Ontario centres since 1980 but the real renter incomes having shown little or no increase. Cities such as St Catharines, Windsor, London and Hamilton have spawned a greater percentage of tenants than Toronto who are in a core, who spend more than 30% of their incomes on accommodation, the report goes. Based upon its findings on federal statistics, the report urges the immediate construction of 27,000 rental units in Ontario to achieve a 3% vacancy rate, which housing officials figure best creates an equilibrium in the marketplace.

It is difficult to know, if that number of units is produced, where in the world the moneys will come from to provide that accommodation. That is certainly one of the topics we had hoped to present to this House, to present information that did not come forward in the committee hearings. We asked for it repeatedly, to talk about the effect of Bill 4 on the economy of this province, on everything from the provision of housing units to job loss to investment, and we were denied that right. The report goes on to say that because of the population increase and dramatic rise in family- and non-family households, Ontario also needs, in addition to the 27,000 rental units that are being suggested, 14,000 to 16,000 new units each year for the next several years.

Clearly we are in a severe housing crisis if this report is even close to being accurate, and I have no reason to believe it is not. The annual requirements would drop somewhat during the late 1990s as population increases level off, the report also says. The report indicated that if the 27,000 units were built as non-profit and co-operative housing, the project would cost \$3 billion to build from money raised through private lenders—that is, of course, assuming we can find private lenders to get involved in this program—and an additional \$298 million in operating subsidies over the period of the projects from government.

That is another topic I have briefly referred to, but I think that in the proposed amendments of the two opposition parties, and hopefully members of the government, we would have an opportunity to get into that, and we are not going to.

The Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association also spoke of: "The rate of household growth will decline as the 1990s wear on, but as we proceed past the year 2000 new strains will be created by factors like the changing housing demands on an aging population. The data paints a bleak picture. One can only imagine what it will look

like if we continue to ignore the trends shaping Ontario's housing requirements."

On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I do not believe we have a quorum.

The Deputy Speaker ordered the bells rung.

1518

Mr Tilson: I would like to read into the record some very important factors from this report on the state of housing of Ontario just to show to the House the importance of this subject and how there is a great need to debate this subject further at this time.

There are three comments actually, two comments. They talk about how, "Non-profit housing continues to evolve into a significant housing option, particularly if government continues the precedent set in 1988 with the progressive 'Homes Now program,' and commits to further support for non-profit and co-operative housing as a means to resolve the housing problems facing Ontario."

I believe that this bill clearly is intended to discourage private enterprise from getting involved in the housing market. There is no question the Premier has made that quite clear in his statements. We have asked him repeatedly. We have asked the Minister of Housing repeatedly, not only in committee but in this House. The whole subject of what this government intends to do with housing is becoming clearer and clearer. It intends to have the taxpayer pay for the housing in this province, and I do not know how we are going to do that.

The report continues. It talks about the predicted surge in population. Now, granted, Bill 4 is a two-year moratorium period, but surely it must show some initiative in starting to deal with the projected trends as to where we are going to go with housing in this province.

I would like to refer to a brief section that this report refers to: "According to conservative demographic figures from the Ministry of Treasury and Economics, Ontario's population is expected to soar to 11.9 million by 2011.

"This, compared to 9.1 million individuals accounted for by the 1986 census, is an increase of 2.8 million persons over a 25-year period—approximately the combined current populations of Metropolitan Toronto and Ottawa.

"According to the same census, there were 2.3 million households in Ontario, of which 1.1 million were renters. These will increase by close to one million households over the next 25 years—of which at least 350,000 to 400,000 will require rental housing.

"Just to keep up with the growth will require the construction of 14,000 to 16,000 rental units per year over the next two decades."

As I indicated previously, "this does not take into account the 27,000 units needed immediately to fill current rental requirements."

Bill 4 does, absolutely nothing to encourage new development of housing units from the private sector, I assume, because the statements have been requested by members of this side to the Premier and to the Minister of Housing as to how the government is going to solve it, and it appears their answer is going to be to deal with non-

profit housing—in other words, subsidized housing from the government. All that is going to be paid for by the taxpayer of this province. As has already been indicated by the member for Durham East, people are concerned with their taxes in this province. The property taxes, all taxes, are soaring unbelievably, and yet this government appears to be intent and determined to improve housing in this province by injecting more government money into it and discouraging private enterprise. I think we are going to have even more crises than what we have now.

The report concludes with a topic called "A Formidable Challenge." It talks about heading into the 21st century. They say that the state of housing in Ontario presents a formidable challenge. Of course the big question is, and with Bill 4, is this government up to it? Is this government up to the challenge that is needed to take us into the 21st century, specifically with housing needs based on the information that this report has revealed?

The report states, "With skyrocketing costs and a dwindling supply of rental stock, the rental market is already unable to accommodate the current need for shelter." That is quite clear. There is no new housing being constructed in the province of Ontario of an appreciable nature to increase the number of units—none. All we hear of is the intent of this government to use taxpayers' money to inject money into the economy to build new rental accommodation. That is unsatisfactory. The taxpayer cannot bear that cost.

"No one municipality is spared or favoured by these conditions—across the province, towns and cities alike are in the same predicament." That is true. This is not a Toronto problem. This is a problem across the entire province, as we have seen from our own hearings that we have taken across this province, whether it be London, Hamilton, Windsor or Ottawa or whether it be the north.

They raised a couple of points I would just like to refer to, first, "Vacancy rates of 0.5% to 1.2% are well below the 'healthy' level of 3%." So that is what we have now: 0.5% to 1.2%.

They talk again. They emphasize how 27,000 units are needed now, are required immediately to reach this 3% vacancy rate. Then they speak about another estimate and, I emphasize, over and above the 27,000 units, 14,000 to 16,000 additional rental units "will be needed each year to keep up with population growth." Of course, this group is talking about the government putting in the money. It is not talking about private enterprise putting in the money. Yes, we need it, but we also need private enterprise, and this government is going to do it on its own.

They state, "Rental household income has failed to keep pace with rent increases." That is the real crisis we face. That is the real crisis this Legislature needs to deal with now. Bill 4 does nothing for the 30% of the existing tenants of this province who cannot afford any increases. Time after time we have heard from students and from senior citizens who cannot afford the increases that are in existence now. They cannot afford the increases that are being put forward by Bill 4. They cannot afford that. Yet this government is ignoring the very people whom it is suggesting to help. I have not heard any suggestions from

the government side. The members sit on their hands. They sat on their hands during the committee and they are sitting on their hands now. There are no amendments that have been put forward by the government to Bill 4 to deal with this subject. In fact, the House leader is simply cutting off the debate. We are not going to be allowed to deal with that subject.

The report also dealt with the fact that, "One third of Ontario tenants pay more than 30% household income to rent, well above a 30% cost-to-income ratio: 477,000 households."

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I believe the member must have read very closely what the resolution is all about, and his debate must indicate this is what he is discussing. This is not what he is doing now.

Mr Tilson: Mr Speaker, with respect, what I propose to do is to raise some of the issues that the time allocation is precluding us from debating, and I submit with respect that I have the right to do that. I have the right to list off why this motion should not carry. This motion should not carry because there is a whole slew of issues that we will not be able to debate. We are going to be given two days to talk about a very serious economic crisis in this province.

The final point that was raised in this report: They talk about provincial housing expenditures increasing since 1986, comprised of only 1.5% of the total budget. I have only mentioned a few sections. You are quite right, Mr Speaker, I do not intend to deal at great length with this specific report, but I think that we should have had an opportunity during the Bill 4 discussions to talk about the whole effect on the economy in this province.

Mr Thom came to the committee one evening; the members may recall or may have seen it on the television or read it in the Hansard. Mr Thom, as the members will recall, has worked on a two-volume report that was initially commissioned by the Conservative Party and followed through with the Liberal Party, and never used by this Legislature. In fact, it was never presented to this Legislature and has yet to be presented to this Legislature. It cost over \$3 million and many hours—years, in fact—to produce this report.

Again I am emphasizing the need to discuss the economic facts that need to be dealt with with respect to Bill 4. Mr Thom came forward at the committee level and referred to some items that spoke specifically about the return on investment, and we are not going to get an opportunity to deal with that subject because of this closure motion. Mr Thom specifically talked about the main reasons for the difficulty in devising appropriate rules and regulations, the difficulty that one is having.

Mr Bisson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: What the member is talking about is not with regard to the motion that is before us today in the House, and I would like to hear that.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much for the advice. I have already advised the member for Dufferin-Peel to stick to the resolution.

Mr Tilson: I would refer to Mr Thom's thoughts on the subject of return on investment, because this is not

going to be dealt with by this House. The members opposite do not care; they do not even want to hear it. Mr Speaker, I would just like to show you a small sense of the importance of this and how we should spend a considerable amount of time on this subject and how it is going to affect the economy of this province.

One of the key reasons for the difficulty the government is having in trying to devise appropriate rules and regulations is that landlords come in all sizes and shapes. There is the mom-and-pop operation. There is the single home owner who puts a couple of rental units in his house; this is very important to him. There is the larger smaller corporation which has perhaps two or three dozen or so units. Then there is the big, monster corporation. They all have one common factor. Now this is basically where the market comes into the picture, into play. This range of landlords have put into it a very substantial personal investment. They borrowed a lot of money which they have to pay back.

The mortgage companies have no qualms about collecting their money on the dot and according to the contract, and the interest rates have been very high all over. The landlords all have to meet a very substantial cost, and they hope to get some return on their equity. Bill 4 completely ignores that subject. Mr Thom is simply saying that the market is going to collapse unless they do deal with it, but we are not going to get a chance to introduce our amendments with respect to that.

1530

Mr Thom also referred to the subject, as I and other members have referred to, of what the government intends to do, and that is to make housing a public utility like Ontario Hydro. I would like to refer specifically to a section where he talks about that. He says, "Who is going to finance the costs of building, renewing, maintaining the rental units which are necessary to house the rental population of Ontario?" Bill 4 ignores all this matter, ignores all these topics. I think that is the question that hopefully we would have an opportunity to debate in the Bill 4 hearings, but the time allocation motion says, "No, we are not going to do that."

This province, this country does not have the money just to throw at the rental housing without the support and input of private landlords. The government should realize by now—we have been trying to hammer away and I think we should have an opportunity to emphasize more—that it needs private enterprise to make the housing system work. They cannot do it alone. They are in for a rude awakening if that is their intent.

"If you want to make rental housing a public utility, go ahead. Make it a public utility like Hydro. It will cost billions and billions of dollars. I simply do not think it can be done. I express now a personal opinion, but I think it is a fair one, that it is vitally important to the financial welfare of this province, let alone the welfare of the housing industry, that there be a very substantial input of private funds."

Again, we have requested information at the committee level and we request it now. We request the opportunity to

put this information forward so that Bill 4 can adequately be debated.

Mr Thom continues by saying:

"The prevailing system of rent regulation since 1975 has been progressively to discourage continuing new investment of private funds and maintaining the current investment of private funds. That is a very serious question in my mind, and although you may feel great sympathy for tenants and the problems they have, which I will mention in a moment, it seems to me most important that if this province is to financially maintain its...double A rating and not have to borrow great sums of money to keep rental housing available, the private money is imperative."

That is the crunch of Bill 4. It affects the whole economic aspect of this province. Clearly, the people outside and inside the province do not have the confidence in this province to invest, certainly in the housing field.

Mr Thom went on to comment: "Private money is essential. If private money is going to stay in and come in in the amounts required, it has to have some expectation of return." What is the expectation of return? When one reads Bill 4, what is the expectation of return? Why would anybody get into the housing market? Why would anybody buy buildings? Why would anybody construct buildings to improve the plight of the tenant or to simply provide more housing? There is no logical reason for it.

Mr Thom says: "About a third of the tenant households in Ontario are poor. That is not the word that is very popular—you can use 'economically disadvantaged'—but they are poor." Clearly that is the group of tenants of whom I have spoken before that this government is ignoring. One third of the tenants of this province are poor; they cannot afford rent increases. Seniors who are on a restricted income, who only have so many funds and if the rents keep going up, have to move. They have to move to apartments that are perhaps of a less high standard and hence their quality of life deteriorates.

They cannot afford from their own resources, incomes, whatever they have, jobs, the rents required to pay economic rents to private landlords. That is one of the facts of life. It has been a fact of life and it will continue to be. Bill 4 does not address that situation and we are not going to have an opportunity to properly debate that.

"At the other end of the scale...10% of the tenant population are quite well-to-do. They want to rent because, well, they are older people who do not want to have the bother and hassle of a house. They are what they call empty-nesters, or were. They would rather be able to travel and go off to Florida in the winter.... They can pay rents of \$1,500, \$2,000 a month; it is perhaps 10%, 12% of their income." That is a real problem. This government is simply providing housing to the rich.

Mr Thom says, "I tell you quite frankly, it has never been clear to me why tenants who can afford to pay economic rents with no problem should have the protection of rent control." Does the government know why they should? Because its Bill 4 certainly does not. We would like an opportunity to discuss that and we are not going to get that. "In the middle, something more than 50% of the tenant population are tenants frequently because they cannot

afford to buy a house.... But the category I am discussing is those who can afford to pay reasonable economic rents."

I am not going to refer any further to items that he raised, but they were a number of lists of topics that he summarized. He only had an evening to present a \$3-million report, a report that he spent years on. The Minister of Housing did not even want to see him. He has not even requested that he see him. The committee did and that was after a great deal of effort by myself and the member for York Mills to try to persuade the government to hear Mr Thom. We finally spent a couple of hours one evening listening to his thoughts, but that is not the way to hear a \$3-million report.

The Minister of Housing and the Premier have simply said they are out to get the big landlords. In fact, they are allergic to them. I find it amazing, that this government which is a government of all the people, or alleges that it is the government of all the people, would make these statements. The Minister of Housing has stated that the Ontario government will not give in to intimidation and pressure from big landlords who want the province's rent control legislation scrapped. Not all landlords are the big cigar-toting individuals with high hats and the types of individuals the Minister of Housing has painted. We have had landlord after landlord just like you or me.

The Deputy Speaker: I want to address these remarks, sir, not only to you but to all the members of the House. Let me read to you what the rules of procedure say: "Rules of Debate"—section 23, page 8—"In a debate, a member shall be called to order by the Speaker if he or she directs his or her speech to matters other than the question under discussion." It is very clear, so you have to maintain your remarks strictly on the notice of motion, simple as that. That is addressed not only to you but to all of you.

Mr Tilson: I appreciate your assistance, Mr Speaker, and I certainly will try and keep my remarks addressed to that subject, because that is a concern certainly we have on this side. Both opposition parties are concerned that we are not having adequate time to address these concerns, and what I propose to do is to illustrate some of the items that we would hope to elaborate on through amendments and perhaps other amendments.

Both the Liberal critic and I have filed sets of amendments, and there may be other amendments that we would hope to raise as time goes on. As I have indicated through the small debate that has occurred, the member for Carleton has introduced two amendments, which I doubt will be reached as a result of the two days that are being proposed, but I certainly will keep my remarks addressed to that and to concerns that we hope will be raised that we are not being able to discuss during the debate.

I would like to refer to a demonstration that occurred last week where the Minister of Housing was burned in effigy on the lawn of this Legislature by a group of 500 landlords and contractors and people who had lost their jobs. He pledged at that time that Bill 4 would proceed and said that the complaints that it was putting business people in financial straits are exaggerated. I find that amazing. After what we heard during the weeks of hearings from

people who would come to us and talk about the problems that were addressed specifically to Bill 4, he was simply saying that the complaints of the people who are going bankrupt are exaggerated.

They are producing documented facts. We are not having an opportunity to present that to this House in the form of an amendment. This motion precludes us from doing that. How he would dare to make that statement that these individuals are exaggerating the facts is simply intolerable.

1540

The Minister of Housing stated: "It's the determination of this government that there's going to be permanent rent control legislation in this province no matter how much money the big landlord organizations spend. That was a commitment that we made and we intend to keep it." I think that is clear from the very outset. He is ignoring the very people of this province that he is trying to protect. He is ignoring the small landlords, the small individuals. He is addressing his comments to the big landlord organizations.

Who says that some of these big landlord organizations are abusing the system? Clearly evidence can be produced that they are, but they are not all bad like he says they are. Not all tenants' organizations are bad. Clearly if legislation is going to be introduced it should be fair to all and not just one select group of individuals.

One of the people who spoke at that time was Martin Cash, who is an owner of Wind-O-Mart, which is a replacement window company based in Toronto that employs 80 people. He said he had lost more than \$7 million of orders since the New Democratic government had announced plans for Bill 4. He said he is going to have to shut down his company if the Legislature approves the bill. We are not having an opportunity to go into those types of stories and to illustrate and try to persuade this government that the bill that it is producing to this House should not be passed. We are not going to have that opportunity. The minority is being trampled on.

We asked questions in this House with respect to the capital expenditures that were being lost by Bill 4. What is going to happen to the people who have spent money under the existing rules of Bill 51? What is going to happen to them? Our submission is that we would encourage the government to put forward an amendment. The government has not filed any amendments. They have filed absolutely no amendments to deal with the capital expenditures that are being lost under Bill 4. We have asked the Minister of Housing what he intends to do about that and he will not give an answer. I believe that we have the right to debate that in the House and to ask for an amendment to try to resolve that situation.

The Concrete Restoration Association of Ontario, in addressing that fact of capital expenditures lost, announced that they felt that there would be 2,000 people in a variety of trades put back to work immediately if the Minister of Housing either announced some plan or made an amendment to Bill 4 that would solve that situation. Of course, that involves the retroactive nature of this legislation, but the minister continues to be silent. He does not care, and this government does not care. This organization made it quite clear that the workers and their equipment were all

ready to go back to work that the workers and people who have been providing services to the people of this province and providing housing accommodation who had lost their jobs because of Bill 4 should be able to continue.

We have heard a great deal about the loss of jobs as a result of Bill 4. We have heard that in committee and we have heard it in submissions made in this House. Clearly we have had financial institutions, we have had landlords, we have had contractors, we have had construction people, come to us and talk about the loss of jobs and we are not going to get an opportunity to adequately present amendments to resolve that issue or to make suggestions to the government. The government is not going to care. It has not filed any amendments.

It was made quite clear in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* on 10 April about the status of unemployment in this province. Clearly, in listening to the facts that we heard from this commission, that we heard during the committee hearings, job losses are occurring as a result of Bill 4. I believe that now is the time to deal with that. The government should not wait until two years have expired. It should not wait. Let's deal with it now. It should not wait until next year to resolve this subject. It should deal with it now.

This came out of the Report on Business of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. It was an article by Drew Fagan, who stated: "The year-long recession is wiping out jobs in Ontario twice as fast as the 1981-82 recession did, Statistics Canada says. In almost every other province, the reverse is true," but not in Ontario.

"The number of jobs in Alberta and British Columbia has actually grown since the recession began last April, and the number of jobs lost in Quebec is less than half of what disappeared there in the first 12 months of the previous recession.

"The figures show that Ontario has really been feeling this recession much more severely than the other provinces.... The recession looks less harsh in Quebec this time than the last one, but the opposite is the case for Ontario."

Clearly the issue of Bill 4 and the effect that it has had on the jobs of this province is a factor that plays in these statistics, and yet we are going to be unable to present amendments—and I would assume the government is going to be unable to present amendments—to try to deal with this subject and try to alleviate the job losses that are occurring in the province of Ontario.

Clearly as a result of Bill 4, I would submit, and the whole impact of Bill 4, real estate is not a good investment in Ontario. Individuals have said that because of the restrictions that have been put on by Bill 4 they are not going to invest in Ontario. I would like to refer to a report that has been referred to at the committee level and in this House, and that is by Royal LePage. It is dated August 1989 and it is for the Ministry of Housing rent review policy branch. It made some interesting comments which illustrate the point that housing is going nowhere in this province and Bill 4 is not going to solve it and we do not have an opportunity to pursue it any further because of the closure motion of this government.

"Over the last 20 years, market values have increased by about 7.7% compounded annually. Considering an ad-

justment for inflation, real growth has been nominal or, in many cases, non-existent; and

"Compared to other investments, residential rent investment has performed poorly. Other real estate markets have higher overall capitalization rates and higher returns. Treasury bills, Canada savings bonds and corporate paper returns have also outpaced rental market returns over the last 20 years. A comparison of Toronto Stock Exchange, ScotiaMcLeod and Morguard property indices show that the rental market index did not perform nearly as well as the other investment markets." Clearly this report then and now shows that real estate is not a good investment, and it is because of this type of legislation that this government is accelerating.

We feel that if we had had an opportunity to present suggestions to this government—and perhaps the government would offer further suggestions after hearing the discussions at the committee level and the comments that have been made by opposition members—it would reconsider some of its positions and amend Bill 4, but we are not going to get that opportunity. The Ministry of Housing and the House leader are determined to slam this legislation through and will not listen to the people of this side or the people of the province of Ontario.

Of course, unless the government reconsiders, and I hope it does reconsider, there are several amendments that we will not have the opportunity to adequately deal with and we will not have the opportunity to adequately debate. One of them had to do with subsection 100e(1) of the bill. That had to do with the topic of extraordinary operating cost, and it was a very simple amendment we made at committee, and that was that the words "garbage tippage fees" be included as one of the extraordinary operating costs.

The Minister of Housing, when I raised this at committee, simply scoffed at that and he said, "Well, we couldn't handle that because of the building operating cost index formulas," and other problems that he had, but he said he would get back to us. He said he would get back to us before this House started and provide us with information so that that would be relieved.

We have not heard from him. This was before the House was to commence. It was not during the debate, and it certainly will not come up in this motion. We only have two days to discuss it.

1550

I referred specifically to a problem that is occurring, and we are hearing it every day, with the problem of waste and the increased tippage fees and the effect that is going to have on the rental accommodation of this province.

There was an article from the *Toronto Star* that spoke of a mandatory 20% cut in packaging that was announced by the Minister of the Environment for all products sold in the province. The announcement would include a requirement that municipalities charge the full cost of dumping garbage in landfills, a measure that could lead to increased tippage fees in many dumps. Toronto area dumps already charge high fees, but others in the province charge low fees or allow free use.

We know what is going to happen. We know perfectly well what is going to happen if this occurs: It is ultimately passed down to the landlord. How is he going to pay for it? This legislation does not deal with it, and we will not be allowed to deal with it adequately.

It was pointed out that since 1983, tippage fees have risen over 600% in the GTA. On average, builders are paying \$300 per home to dispose of the approximately 2.5 tonnes of garbage. Clearly it is a very serious problem with the tippage fees.

The minister commented that as a result of this admission at the committee, "I would be willing to share that information with the opposition critics after the ministry has done some assessment of the problem." Further on he states, "And I just asked the member to take my commitment that this matter will be assessed, and we will share that information with the opposition critics between now and when the House comes back and see if there is any way that it can be addressed if the assessment shows that it needs to be done."

I accepted that as an undertaking. I accepted that as an undertaking by a minister of the crown to provide that information, as he said, "prior to when the House comes back," and we have not received this information. In fact, I do not know when I can actually ask the minister that question. I do not see anybody. I do not see the minister or the parliamentary assistant present so that we can even ask that question today. So dealing specifically on this resolution, we are simply not going to have an opportunity to do that. That is particularly after a minister gave such an undertaking, that he would provide that information "prior to when the House comes back."

That is just one of the topics that we are not going to be able to debate if this motion carries. I would like to refer to a principle that the minister had announced back in the early part of this year, that he was obviously concerned with the subject of capital expenditures. Now, I know the Liberal Party and certainly our party had intended to bring motions dealing with the whole subject of capital expenditures and how that subject was going to be dealt with. We are not going to get an opportunity to adequately deal with that. It is quite clear. We spent some time during the committee level, and I would hope that all members would have an opportunity to contribute to that subject. We have spent some time on the issue of retroactivity, but clearly the subject of capital expenditures is an item that has not even been touched and it will take some time, I feel, to adequately deal with the problem.

Back in January the Ontario government announced that it would pour an extra \$35 million into a variety of housing projects this year as part of an anti-recession effort, including \$15 million to help private landlords carry out major repairs on low-rise buildings. Now, of course, this is something that has gone on before and yet it is sort of like the announcement today. No new incentive is being put forward, nothing is being put forward, and we would challenge the minister during this debate to put that forward. But we are not going to be able to do that.

Going on in this newspaper report, which comes from the *Globe and Mail*, 23 October, he stated: "Money is not

intended to mollify landlords who are angry over the government's proposed rent control law, which prevents them from passing on the costs of major repairs to tenants. The purpose of this is to create jobs." Can members imagine? "The purpose of this is to create jobs," yet previously he said that everybody was exaggerating the problems, that the jobs were being exaggerated, that the bankruptcies were being exaggerated. He said: "The purpose of this is to create jobs. I do not necessarily think there is a connection between the \$15-million program and the landlords' concerns over Bill 4, as the rent control legislation is known."

Clearly, as one of the landlord groups referred to, this is reaching a new height of hypocrisy as far as the Minister of Housing is concerned. Clearly it would be bizarre for the government to announce funds to encourage repairs on the one hand, while pushing forward with legislation that will discourage landlords from doing so. So if he says on the one hand he is going to initiate this funding to encourage repairs, yet Bill 4 is silent on it.

We will not have an opportunity to debate that and to add an amendment which would provide for capital expenditures to be made during this moratorium period. We are not going to be allowed to do that because the wording in the motion talks about a time frame as to submitting amendments and clearly, as debate goes on, if there are any new amendments that would occur or that members would think of, we will not be allowed to deal with those.

We think the whole process that the minister is continually trying to force this legislation through—it took us a great deal of effort to have this committee go to different cities in the province of Ontario. One of the cities we had hoped to go to was Thunder Bay, and that was not allowed. Just to show members the unfairness, this is a letter to the parliamentary assistant for the Ministry of Housing, and it comes from Shelley Martin from Port Arthur: "It has come to my attention that the standing committee on general government, which is at the present time considering Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986, will not be meeting in Thunder Bay." That was a concern that we had: Why did it not go to Thunder Bay? "I am greatly disappointed," she says. A copy of this letter went to the Attorney General, it went to the Minister of Mines and it went to the Chairman of the committee.

She says: "I am greatly disappointed. We must allow residents of northwestern Ontario an opportunity to express their position on this legislation. We will be seen as cutting off the political process. This is very damaging to our government." I will say it is damaging to our government. They do not even want to talk about it. They certainly do not want to talk about it in Thunder Bay, and we are not going to be given an opportunity to talk about it in this House.

"As I understand it, the ad, of which a copy is attached, appeared in a local Thunder Bay paper on 3 January. I draw to your attention the last sentence in the ad, which states, 'Requests for appointments to appear before the committee to make oral representation should be directed to the clerk of the committee no later than Friday 25 January 1991 for consideration by the committee.' I feel this is

very clear and urge you and your committee colleagues to reconsider holding the hearings in Thunder Bay."

The NDP members of the committee felt that was not needed and we did not meet in Thunder Bay and we did not meet in Peterborough. We did not meet in a number of cities in which representation to hold meetings was requested.

We have not adequately heard from the people of this province. We have not adequately heard from at least 100 individuals and groups that wanted to address the committee and we are not going to be allowed to debate Bill 4 because of this closure motion.

There were some concerns that some of the groups put forward as to the need for housing in this province and we feel that it is all relevant, that it should be put forward in Bill 4 legislation, because Bill 4 is silent on many matters. We had hoped that we would be able to introduce the amendments that we have filed and possibly, with further debate, to introduce further amendments, but we are not going to have that opportunity.

One of the groups that did speak to us, the Association For Furthering Ontario's Rental Development, commented that "the current government is ideologically committed to pervasive and extensive government control of and involvement in the rental housing market in Ontario, both for short-term political reasons and because in principle they prefer government control to private enterprise." That is a concern that we have. We think that is a wrong process, to proceed to more government control and less assistance from private enterprise. But with this motion, if this motion passes, we will not be able to put that forward.

They talked about six objectives that we should be looking at with respect to Bill 4. I would have hoped that we would have an opportunity to elaborate on some of these items and I would like to briefly refer to them without going into great detail, because I suppose there is always the chance that the government could change its mind and withdraw this motion or hopefully defeat it.

1600

The six objectives that were put forward by this organization were as follows:

First, "That we need an adequate supply of rental housing at all price levels." I would hope that all three parties of this House would admit that as one of the objectives. In fact, I would hope they would agree with all of these objectives.

Second, we "need to keep Ontario's aging rental housing stock in good and usable condition."

Third, "That we want a rental housing market that is fair." Of course, that is a subject that I have asked the Premier, I have asked the Minister of Housing, I have asked the parliamentary assistant about, and I would hope that I would have further opportunity to discuss with this House and to raise issues with this House as to whether the legislation is fair, but I am not going to have an opportunity to do that.

The fourth objective would be that, "Those in financial need should have reasonable and realistic access to clean and safe rental housing." Do we? Does Bill 4 deal with that? We would hope that amendments would come for-

ward in the Bill 4 discussions that would provide that or provide a suggestion to move in that direction. But we are not going to hear about that.

Fifth, "We must...strive for the most cost-effective possible use of taxpayers' money". Clearly we are not going to be in that position as well, because of this resolution that was put forward by the government House leader.

Finally, the organization spoke of the need for a "renting partnership" in Ontario, so that "landlords and tenants can work more positively and co-operatively together than they have in the past because both have direct and legitimate interests and concerns that must be addressed if we are to find fair and effective solutions."

This government is only interested in one party. They are not concerned with all of the people of this province. I am not going to speak for the official opposition, but I can certainly speak for ourselves. We are in support of all of the people of this province. We are concerned with this economic situation. We are not just restricting our thoughts to one particular group. We are being fair. Is the government?

"Bill 4 eliminates the 'capital improvement' basis for rental increases over and above the basic inflationary increase of 5.4%.

"With this bill, the NDP will remove the provision that permitted landlords to apply for increases, phased over the useful life of the capital improvement, for major repairs to rental buildings."

That is all gone and we feel that we should be able to put forward an amendment and properly debate it, not with the restrictions that are put forward by this government to discuss that subject.

"Bill 4 also eliminates the provision for rental increases over and above the basic guideline increase in cases where the building is losing money." That is what exists now. Bill 4 does away with all that and that is one of the items, of course, that is causing the bankruptcies. Bankruptcy after bankruptcy has been documented and this government refused to deal with it at committee and it is refusing to deal with it now. They are simply putting forth closure and saying: "That's it. We won't discuss it any more."

The organization that I am referring to asked the simple question, "What impact will these two changes"—the two that I have just referred to—"have on each of the six objectives for rental housing in Ontario that I believe we all agree upon?...Bill 4 simply will not work to help Ontario reach the rental housing objectives we all share." I cannot believe that this government will believe that it will.

Therefore, we, all members of the House, should have an opportunity to put forward amendments to attempt to solve problems that have been created by Bill 4. If passed, they will have a dastardly effect on the economy of this province.

"What impact will Bill 4 have on the supply of rental housing in the province?" That question has been asked and we all know that it will not have any effect, absolutely nothing to encourage the supply of rental housing in this province. I would just like to read a brief statement from

this report that was submitted by this organization. This is referring to the government, of course:

"What they will most certainly do will be to eliminate new private sector investment in rental housing in this province. They have an immediate and direct negative impact on the viability of rental housing businesses and on the asset value of rental buildings.

"For virtually everyone who bought a building in the last four years, the Bill 4 changes means the owner will be locked into a negative cash flow position in perpetuity." For ever.

We have not had an adequate opportunity to debate that subject. It has not been adequately dealt with. In fact, it has been very rarely referred to. The report goes on to say:

"Not surprisingly, this has translated into an immediate fall in the market value of apartment buildings: on average, we estimate the value of these investments has fallen in the order of 25% as a direct result of Bill 4. This drop in value means that, even where landlords want to do so, their ability to borrow to finance repairs or improvements is diminished. There is no incentive for investors to own apartment buildings, to buy apartment buildings or to build apartment buildings."

I submit that we in the opposition, and even government members, should have an opportunity to put forward facts that would show the government what it is doing to the investment of this province, what it is doing to the apartment buildings of this province, not only the capital expenditures that are required or the lack of supply of rental housing in this province. We are not able to do that. With this resolution, we are not able to do that.

The report goes on to talk about the preservation of Ontario's rental housing stock. Clearly there is some reference in the section that talks about necessary improvements, but it is very minor. I have given one example as to where that should be amended, but we are not going to get a chance to debate that, or at least debate it adequately.

Will the changes in Bill 4 keep Ontario's aging rental housing stock in good and usable condition? The statistics show that 75% to 80% of the buildings of this province are 20 years or more old, and clearly it is going to be impossible, with this Bill 4, to keep those buildings in a good and stable condition. It will actually do the opposite. It will have an opposite effect, because no work is going to get done at all. I feel that that, along with the retroactive aspect, is a subject on which we need to put forward some constructive amendments and we are not going to get an opportunity to do that.

This report commented that:

"In Ontario, most engineering studies conducted for condominium developments recommend that 20% or more of operating revenues be retained for major repairs. The legislation governing condominiums dictates that a minimum of 10% of fee revenues be set aside for major repairs. The rent review formula prevents any such planning."

Well, there is nothing. Bill 4 does not deal with this, and yet we are not going to have an opportunity to even put forward an amendment to suggest that this topic be dealt with.

"The current capital improvement provisions"—that is, those that are in existence now—"were added to rent review to ensure that where normal maintenance and repairs were sufficient to preserve the housing stock, rent increases would be limited to the inflationary level and, where major repairs were needed to preserve the building, there was a controlled and monitored mechanism to permit the costs of those investments to be recovered from the renter over time.

"This provision did not, in general, result in significant rent increases in Ontario. Ministry of Housing statistics show that—for the 22 months ending last October—almost three quarters of all apartments in Ontario experienced no increase over and above the 4.6% inflationary increase for any reason. And these same statistics show that the average increase for major repairs was less than 3% above the guideline rate....

"So, this provision did not lead to soaring rents, but it did make it possible for landlords to make these investments with reasonable confidence that, over the useful life of the new roof or new furnace or new elevator or new security system or new plumbing, they would be able to recover their costs. The provision made it possible for landlords to negotiate loans to pay for these improvements, because it provided a repayment source."

1610

Now I do not know where this government thinks the money is going to come from to solve these problems, because Bill 4 is silent on that. I know the Liberal opposition and certainly the Conservative Party have suggestions to deal with that subject and I think that we should be given an opportunity to debate it and try and persuade the government to change its mind on a very serious mistake that it is making. Where is the money going to come from? How are our buildings going to be maintained? How are we going to stop the quality of life of the tenant from sliding? We are not going to get a chance to debate that. This government is just determined to slam this legislation through and the heck with the tenants, the heck with the landlords, the heck with the people.

"Bill 4 removes that repayment source" that exists under the current legislation "and removes the reasonable expectation of recovering costs," a process that the people of this province, landlord, tenant, contractor, employer, employee, grew to understand and realize was a bad system. But you do not make it retroactive. You do not let them make the expenditures, do the work and then cancel everything, because that is only going cause bankruptcy, it is only going to cause losses in employment, it is only going to cause a deterioration in the quality of life of the tenants of the province. But we are not going to be able to talk about that.

The report goes on, "The business people who own rental buildings will seek to avoid, cancel or postpone these investments." That is what is happening, and hopefully the government members, as time goes on—I can understand the minister and the House leader trying to ram this legislation through, because more and more horror stories are occurring all the time and naturally they want to get the legislation out of the way so they can get on to

other things, so that these facts will not be revealed before the legislation is passed.

"The lenders who have provided the funds for capital improvements have already indicated that they are no longer willing to make such loans." We never really adequately presented that information or had that information presented to us at the committee. We had hoped that we, through debate, would be able to introduce comments from financial institutions that would show that they are no longer willing to invest to improve the capital expenditures, capital improvements that are so badly needed for the apartments of this province.

The report goes on to say that:

"Bill 4 will not work to help preserve Ontario's rental housing stock. On the contrary, it will accelerate the deterioration in our aging rental housing by discouraging investment in needed major repairs."

Now the report gets on to a subject which I have attempted to raise with the Minister of Housing, with the Premier, with the parliamentary assistant in this House, in this committee. Clearly I can understand why this motion is being put forward to restrict us from debating it, because I intended to raise that question again: Is the government being fair? Is Bill 4 being fair? That talks about the issue of fairness, of the issue of achieving rental housing markets that are fair, and we are not going to be able to debate that.

The report talked about that for some length, and I would like to refer to some sections where this is referred to, just to show members the importance of this subject and how, I submit, we are not going to be able to properly put this position forward to the government members and hope that they would reconsider their position. Speaking of the fairness, of achieving a rental housing market that is fair:

"This, of course, is the main motivation the government has claimed in proposing these changes. Throughout the recent election campaign"—and this report, I might add, was back in January—"and since, the NDP repeatedly assert that the rental housing market in Ontario is rife with abuse."

Yet they will not allow us to talk about the abuse that they are handing the people of this province. They will not allow us to debate that. They are going to put restrictions on us to debate that subject. They will not allow us to debate the very issue as to why they say Bill 4 was introduced in the first place.

"The Premier and his Minister of Housing have talked of 'loopholes' in rent review, of 'gouging landlords,' of 'flips' designed to defeat the intent of rent review, of 'unnecessary repairs' designed to push up rents. The Premier has even spoken, on several occasions, of 'rent increases of 100% or more' as though these were daily and consistent occurrences in Ontario."

That, I submit, is the "big lie," and I put that in quotation marks. I am not saying that the Premier has lied, but I am saying it is the big lie. It is the creating of a situation that simply does not exist. They have put forward statements and they are not giving us adequate time to respond to those statements, to prove it, put facts forward to this

House to refute what both the minister and the Premier have stated.

The report goes on:

"There is only one real problem with all of these statements; they are not true...."

"The facts show that the rental housing market in Ontario has not been rife with abuse. And we're not suggesting you take our word for it. Instead, let's look at the figures provided by CMHC and by the Ministry of Housing in Ontario.

"According to CMHC, the average rent for privately owned apartments in the city of Toronto is just over \$600 and that average rent increased by about 5.8% between October 1989 and October 1990. That's not exactly a portrait of a rental market running out of control or rife with so-called gouging."

So again, the facts have been created to show a crisis that exists in housing, but not in this particular area, and we are not given a chance to refute that.

"The Premier has spoken of 'increases of 100% or more' as though that were the pattern in Ontario. But how many of these 100%-plus increases actually occurred?"

"Well, there is a total of about 1.2 million rental units in Ontario. According to the Ministry of Housing's own statistics, a grand total of 154—that's one out of every 13,000 suites in the province—experienced increases over 100% in the 22 months ending in October 1990. Those same Ministry of Housing figures tell us that almost 888,000 units, or 74% of the total, experienced rent increases at or below the guideline level of 4.6%."

Now, is that gouging landlords? Are there gouging landlords there? We are not going to be able to show facts to the contrary, because we are only to be given two days to put forward amendments on the whole subject. That is all we are being given.

"Some renters did face increases higher than 4.6%, primarily resulting from rent review decisions relating to capital improvements or operating losses. But were those increases excessive or out of control?"

"Let's look again at the Ministry of Housing statistics. They tell us that there are just under 269,000 units, about 22.5% of the total, that experienced rent increases between 4.6% and 14% over that 22-month period as a result of rent review decisions relating to capital improvement or operating loss."

They talk about two points with respect to this issue that has been raised:

"The first is that any increases over and above the guideline level were granted only where rent review was convinced that the increases were necessary to cover the costs of needed major repairs or to offset demonstrated financial losses. Renters were informed and they had an opportunity to object if they wished. These were not automatic increases by any means at all."

They were not automatic. They were approved by the rent review legislation. Now, that is not what the Premier said. So we are not getting a chance to go into detail and to cross-examine the three members as to why they made those statements, and we are not going to be given an

opportunity to make amendments to counteract what they are saying.

1620

"The second point we should keep in mind as we look at these numbers"—these figures that I have just read to members—"is that the majority of increases for capital improvement or operating losses were far lower than that 14% level. The average increase for capital improvements and for operating losses was less than 3% above the guideline rate over this period."

I would like to just briefly refer to a final section in this report on that subject, where they cite an example, to give the members here today a sense of what was normal under the rent review rules that this government intends to scrap. The report speaks of a building with 200 units where the roof leaks. It is an old building. The landlord, the report indicates, got three quotes for a new roof and the low bid was \$150,000. Naturally, the legislation says, "You do the work first and then we'll talk about it." So once the work was done, he could apply to rent review for an increase. How big would the increase be?

"Well, the assumption that rent review would make was that the roof would have a 15-year life, so the increase would be designed to pay off the costs over 15 years.... The rental increase in that case if rent review approved it would be about \$9.25 per suite per month. That's a 1.5% rent increase.

"And that, unlike the alleged '100% and higher' increases Mr Rae and his colleagues speak of, is characteristic of the kinds of levels of increases that have been occurring in Ontario's rental housing market."

Clearly there have been abuses of the system, but you do not destroy the whole system just to try and deal with those one or two specific individuals. You do not destroy the whole system.

"The fact is that a grand total of less than 4% of all rental units faced rent increases greater than 14% over this 22-month period, and any increase greater than 4.6% was granted only after extensive examination by the Ministry of Housing."

The report stated that they did not know where the 154 units whose rents went up by 100% or more are located, but they do know that:

"It would be far more effective, and far less disruptive of the rental housing market as a whole in Ontario, for the Ministry of Housing to investigate each and every one of those 154 units, or indeed to examine the 4% whose rents went up by 15% or more, than it is to scrap the rent review system that existed in Ontario until the announcement of Bill 4."

We are not getting an opportunity to do that. We are not getting an opportunity to tell the government that is what it should be doing, it should be scrapping this legislation and dealing specifically with the abuses that clearly have existed, and there are ways for it to do that. There are ways for them to amend the legislation, if it does not already exist, to deal with those terrible abuses.

Certainly we had situation after situation come to us at the committee level by tenants who described unbelievable treatment they have had from landlords, and there is no

question that those landlords should be apprehended and treated accordingly, but the ministry is not doing that. Instead they are scrapping everything and they are putting forward a system that is going to cause great abuse on everyone: tenants, landlords, employees, investors and the entire housing market.

The report went on to talk about access to housing for those in financial need, and of course that is one item in the bill which is completely silent and to which we had proposed to put forward amendments, but we are not going to get that opportunity; in other words, an amendment to protect the poor of this province. This government does not care about the poor of this province. They do not care about the 30% population of tenants who cannot afford any increase. The government has suggested that the purpose of Bill 4 is at least in part to protect the poor. Does it? We do not have a chance to discuss that because of this resolution that is going to go through. We are not going to have an opportunity to adequately deal with that whole subject.

I would like to specifically refer to some facts that are referred to in this report:

"It is a fact that the vast majority of any rent savings produced by Ontario's rent control system are enjoyed, not by the poor, but by middle- and upper-income tenants. CMHC statistics show that more than half of all rental units are occupied by middle-income people, and because they occupy the higher-quality, more expensive rental units, they benefit disproportionately in dollar terms. And we all know from our own experience that in many cases these apartments that are the biggest 'bargains,' whose rents have been kept artificially low relative to the market because of rent controls, are occupied, not by the poor, but by the middle-income renters."

The legislation is silent on the very people this government is attempting to help. They are not going to deal with it. They are refusing to deal with it. We attempted at the committee level to put forward amendments to deal with it, but they were silent. They sat on their hands. We had proposed to put forward amendments and to debate this subject in an intelligent way to show that this is the real crunch of the problem: What are we going to do with the poor people? What are we going to do with the people who cannot afford the increases that this government is forcing upon them?

"CMHC tells us that the average Ontario renter spends only 18% of gross income on shelter costs, including utilities and parking in most cases.

"That there are renters—significant numbers of renters—who pay more and who are in financial need is undeniable. In fact, about 28% of renters in Ontario pay more than 30% of their incomes for shelter.

"Will these people benefit from Bill 4?"

Will they? Will they benefit from Bill 4?

"On the short term...they may to the extent that Bill 4 permits them to avoid rent increases that they might otherwise have had to face."

There is no question about that.

"But Bill 4 will do nothing," the report goes on, "to attack the fundamental problem these people face. Their

problem is not a rent problem, it is an income problem, and it requires specific and targeted measures to provide income support and opportunities for these individuals."

Bill 4 will not do anything with respect to that, and we will not have an opportunity to adequately debate that in detail, because that is one of the major problems that is being caused by this legislation. It is not addressing the people who cannot afford the rent increases that are being put forward by this legislation. We want to deal with that. We want to deal with that in the form of amendments and debate, but we are being muzzled by this government.

The report goes on to say,

"The way to help these individuals is not to impose new restrictions on the rental housing market as a whole in Ontario, but to provide with the income they need in the form of more generous social assistance, including rent subsidies where it is deemed useful, and enhanced training and employment opportunities."

What is this government doing to solve that problem? Think about it. What is it doing? Absolutely nothing. We want an opportunity, we want the right to debate those issues and we are not being given that right.

The report goes on:

"Instead, by reducing the supply of rental housing in Ontario, Bill 4 will offer more and more of those with the lowest incomes nothing better than access to waiting lists for public housing. Bill 4 will not work to achieve real improvements in the situations of those with the lowest incomes in Ontario. Instead, in the medium and longer term the provisions in this bill will, if they do anything, make the situation of those in need worse, not better."

Clearly you do not need to be a smart individual to realize that when you look at the rent increases that are being put on top of rents 30% of the renters are saying they cannot afford now.

We are not being given an opportunity to debate that. We are being given two days, a day in this committee to put forward amendments and debate them. I do not think for one minute we are going to be able to debate all those amendments adequately, and we are certainly not going to be given the right to introduce new amendments as time goes on where issues may be raised. Hopefully we are raising some of them now, which would spur some of the members on to introduce more amendments, because clearly Bill 4 needs more amendments.

The report indicates on the effective use of taxpayers' money. I think that Bill 4 is silent on that subject. The report states that:

"Because of Bill 4, more of the taxpayers' money will be spent to provide housing for fewer people in Ontario.

"Today in Ontario about 85% of all rental housing is provided by the private sector, by Ontario's 100,000 landlords. The cost to the taxpayer is virtually nil.

"By contrast, let us look at the cost to Ontario's taxpayers of that other 15%, of public and so-called not-for-profit housing in this province. The costs to the taxpayer are huge and they, unlike rent tenants are paying in private apartments in Ontario, are soaring." The increases will increase and will continue to accelerate, and we will not have a chance to deal with that because of this resolution.

We will not be given any opportunity. I can assure the members that one day will not adequately deal with this and the other issues that were raised. Four days we discussed in committee. Since then, more items have been put forward, certainly to members of the opposition and I hope to members of the government, on issues that were not raised in committee.

1630

The report goes on to say:

"There is not enough money to provide public housing or co-op housing solutions to all those who need them. By picking these high-cost alternatives, government is in effect choosing to favour one group over another. A few thousand get housing...but far more get access only to waiting lists."

That is the pitch that this government has. They are not going to give you housing; they are going to put you on a waiting list. They are going to put you on a waiting list for housing that does not even exist because it does not have the money to put forward the 27,000 units immediately and the 14,000 to 16,000 units that are needed each year. They do not have the money unless they completely bankrupt the people of this province.

The report goes on to say: "Government has its existing investment in public housing, and that housing must be maintained." I agree with that. I believe there should be a mix between private and public enterprise with respect to housing, but you do not put it all into public housing. You do not take over the housing industry, as the Premier of this province is suggesting. We are not going to get a chance to discuss that. We are simply allowing his statement to stand uncontradicted, undenied by the members of this government.

Government has its existing improvement in public housing and that housing must be maintained and improved where possible. If it is necessary to spend more and ensure that these communities are safe and secure, then more must be spent. Clearly, the writing is on the wall. If they are not going to allow private enterprise to get into the housing market, they are not going to allow them to continue into the housing market, they are going to have to spend more and more and more of the taxpayers' dollars until we are all broke. We are not going to be able to debate that. We are not going to be able to put forward amendments and adequately debate that subject either.

The report also talked about a subject I have raised in the past and other members of this House have dealt with in the past, and that is the relationship between the landlord and the tenant. I referred to a situation yesterday, a report from the Toronto Sun which talked of the antagonism that Bill 4 had created between a landlord and his tenants. It is all because of Bill 4.

I do not think it is too late to reverse some of the problems that have been caused by Bill 4. Clearly, Bill 4 has created uncertainty. It has created a situation where people do not trust this government, do not trust the province of Ontario. It is not too late to withdraw Bill 4 and make amendments to it that would at least soften some of the terrible things the government is creating for the people of this province.

The report talked about the renting partnership in Ontario.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Haslam): I know the member has been reminded before and I shall read again standing order 23 regarding speaking unnecessarily "from verbatim reports of the legislative debates or any other document." Please refer to the motion which deals with the resolution of closure.

Mr Tilson: Madam Speaker, I thank you very much for drawing that to my attention. Clearly, as I have tried to do, I am trying to show topics that I feel need to be debated further in this House. There is a list of them, and I listed quite a number of them yesterday. These topics are not going to be dealt with if this resolution is passed. We are going to be shut up, we are going to be told to sit down. "You do it our way and we are not even going to allow you to talk."

But, Madam Speaker, I appreciate your thoughts and I will try to speak to the resolution. Again, I say that one of the topics this resolution will preclude us from speaking to is the renting partnership that is needed in Ontario. We need a partnership in Ontario between the tenant and the landlord. We need that to have a successful industry. We need that to have co-operation between tenants and landlords. This legislation is discouraging that, and we are not going to get an opportunity to get into that whole subject.

In fact, Bill 4 has gone the other way, and the report speaks of that. It says what we need is an "establishment of better and more positive working relationships between landlords and renters in Ontario.... Bill 4 will not work to encourage or support such a partnership. Instead, Bill 4, from the rhetoric that has accompanied it to the specific measures included in it, presents landlords and renters as adversaries and landlords and governments as enemies." That is the problem Bill 4 has created. It has made enemies between landlords and tenants. It has made enemies between the people of this province and the government.

I am sure that this government was most sincere during the election campaign, that it wanted to help the people in the housing industry. I am sure its members believed that, but they are not doing it. In fact, they have created an adversarial system.

I think that we in opposition have the right to debate that subject. We have the right to suggest amendments that would alleviate that problem. It would create a better atmosphere in the province of Ontario with respect to the relationship between tenants and landlords, because clearly I believe that with Bill 51 that situation existed, and I think the members from the government would admit that. I think we need to spend some time on that, because these are serious problems. We are into a recession. Hopefully, we are finding our way out of it, but there needs to be more co-operation between everyone, not just between the tenants and the government, but between the landlords and the tenants, the landlords and the government, the employees and all those involved in the housing industry.

You just do not pick one particular group because they may have more votes. When you consider the legislation as a whole and how it affects the overall economy of this province, we are all going to lose: the tenants of this prov-

ince, the people of this province, the landlords of this province, the employees of this province. I believe we should spend some time on this subject, and we are not being given that opportunity as a result of this resolution. We are going to be shut off from that subject.

I will not refer any further to that report. From the very outset we really have not had adequate time to properly deal with this legislation, perhaps one of the most important pieces of legislation that this government will introduce. The committee was promised five weeks of public hearings and this was cut back by the NDP members to three weeks. The NDP controls the committee, of course, and it controls the votes and it refused a Conservative motion to have a witness called from the Trust Companies Association of Canada. We simply were not allowed to do that.

I think facts such as that were needed to study the whole situation. There is still time to present that information to this House. It is out there. We were precluded from doing that by the government members at the committee level, but it is not too late. If the minister withdraws this motion or members vote against this motion, we will have an opportunity to properly discuss that subject.

I have referred to the number of speakers and delegations that wish to speak and were not allowed the right to speak. I think that is something we repeatedly asked for. We offered that we would be prepared to meet in the evenings, on Mondays and Fridays, to enable the people of this province to properly put forward their concerns, but the NDP controlled the committee and refused us that right.

1640

There is still time to discuss these things because these people who have put forward written submissions were not heard by the committee. They were read, I assume. I read them and I assume government members have read them and I am certain the Liberal members have read them.

I question whether the government members have read them because of the silence that is going on in this House. Either they have read them and they have ignored them or they have not read them, but clearly we have an obligation, I believe, as legislators to hear from many, if not all, of the people of this province who are concerned with legislation as important as this. This resolution precludes us from doing that. We simply will not have an opportunity to present those concerns to this House in the form of an amendment or in the form of debate, simply to illustrate how this bill should be amended or even withdrawn.

There has been discussion by various groups, and I have referred to one, where they went into some detail on the problems of Bill 4. We could go on at some length with some of those concerns and I believe that we have an obligation to go on at some length with some of these issues, particularly the issue of retroactivity, particularly the issue of capital expenditures and some of the issues that were raised by both parties with respect to amendments.

We did not have an opportunity to discuss the whole purpose of the bill. We have been made quite aware that we have two days for amendments, for debates, and one is

not allowed to put so many amendments in after a certain time has passed, I believe after 4 o'clock on the day the resolution is passed. So I think we have to look at the task of this Legislature, this committee, in determining whether in fact these problems that have been suggested by the Minister of Housing and the Premier existed. Did they exist to the degree proposed by the Minister of Housing, if at all? Did these exist at all? If they did not exist at all, then the bill should be retracted, should be withdrawn or defeated. But we are not going to have an opportunity to do that because I suspect that most of our time will be spent on several of the major issues such as retroactivity, capital expenditures, and that we will not have an opportunity to get into some of the issues that were raised by the Minister of Housing and the Premier.

Second, I believe we must evaluate whether this legislation targets an actual problem, and if it does so in a fair manner. In other words, why is he doing it? We should discuss this at great length.

The Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario made extensive remarks to the committee, and of course has been one of the leaders in opposing this bill, but I think it should be listened to. I think they should be at least considered. I do not believe this Legislature has adequately listened to some of the issues that were raised by this and other groups.

They state in their brief to us that, whether out of ignorance of the facts or political malice, the government has grossly exaggerated any problems in need of redress. They have purposely avoided simple and reasonable means of addressing the concerns which exist in favour of drastic and far-reaching legislation and they have done so in a way which unfairly and illegally discriminates against thousands of citizens whose only crime is to have invested in the Ontario economy.

That is a basic statement we should spend some considerable time on, but we are not allowed to do that. We are not allowed to debate the whole myth that has been created by this government. Fair Rental discussed this: it discussed the topic of myth versus reality. I believe that we too should discuss the subject of the big lie, and we are not able to do that.

They state: "In examining this proposed legislation, it is first essential to establish a common fact base for discussion. So many myths have been promulgated about the rental housing situation in Ontario that reasoned discussion cannot occur until these are corrected."

The government keeps talking that it has a game plan, that it has a green paper and that it has permanent legislation in mind. I suspect the permanent legislation has already been drafted because of their conduct with respect to the green paper debate, which the committee has not even discussed. The committee has read it but we have not discussed it, even though this Legislature put forward terms of reference for that committee to discuss it.

The report proceeds by stating: "The popularity of such myths should not be surprising given their constant repetition by prominent figures. In an attempt to justify and defend Bill 4, members of the Ontario government have mounted a virtual campaign to promote these fictions."

There is clearly a housing problem, but when you think about it, what is the problem? There is a whole series of people in this province who cannot afford the rents they are paying now. Does Bill 4 deal with that? No, it does not even come close to dealing with it. It freezes rents at specific increases. The government has continued to allow the increases to the very people who cannot even afford those increases. I believe we should spend extensive time on that. It may be a subject that should not even be in the Bill 4 legislation.

In other words, some of the items that are referred to in Bill 4 perhaps should be taken out of Bill 4 and put into some sort of social legislation. That whole concept, I believe, should be debated, and we are not to be given the opportunity to do that.

The report continues by saying, "The elements of this 'big lie' program are the classical tools of propaganda: distortion and avoidance of the facts..." The report goes on to state that "the administration has even gone so far as to politicize the normally objective information services of the government." They give an example, an extract from the circular produced by the Ministry of Housing to describe Bill 4, which states: "Tenants will no longer be required to pay rent increases to finance luxury renovations or the flipping of apartment buildings. As well, tenants will not face rent increases arising from capital expenditures."

I demand to debate that in this House. I do not think this government should be allowed to perpetrate that big lie because the facts have been put forward in the committee of this government that say that just does not exist, that those are myths. I think the minister and his government should be held accountable, and we are not being allowed to do that. We are not being allowed to debate that.

The report goes on to say, "To the uninformed reader, this would clearly convey the message that"—and I am referring to this quotation—"a luxury renovations are a widespread problem." Are they a widespread problem? We do not think so at the committee, but I think we should have an opportunity to discuss that, and we are not being given an opportunity to discuss that because of the resolution.

The report continues, "(b) either all sales of apartment buildings are 'flips,' or only flips are prevented by this bill." Now, if flips are a problem, is that the sole reason why Bill 4 is being introduced? That subject was hammered away at by the minister. I can recall when he first introduced his legislation. I believe we should be able to debate that, and we are not being able to debate that as a result of this resolution.

To continue, "(c) capital expenditures are a minor concern which will incidentally be affected." Well, now, really. After report after report and delegation after delegation has come to us, the committee members from the government who sat on that committee obviously were deaf or they did not hear what was being said. I believe that the members of the opposition and indeed perhaps members of the government who have heard from their constituents—and I cannot believe that they are not hearing from their constituents on this subject—should be

given an opportunity to put forward their views in this House.

But no. The Minister of Housing and his House leader are saying, "No, that's the end, we're not going to discuss it any more," even though constituent after constituent in all of our ridings has discussed this subject with us. None of the above is true, yet no citizen will learn the facts from the material being circulated by the government. We have not learned that during the committee hearings and we are not being given an opportunity as a result of this resolution.

"Given the narrow focus of these hearings, discussions of some of the most widespread myths—that all tenants are in need of subsidization, for instance, or that controls have no impact on the supply of rental housing—will have to await the committee's deliberation later this winter. In setting the stage for the current discussion, though, it is important to recognize that rents in Ontario are not excessive and rental housing is not beyond the reach of the average tenant."

1650

Clearly, for some tenants it is; clearly, for some tenants it is beyond their reach. They do not have the money to pay the rent; they do not have the money to buy food; they do not have the money to clothe themselves. What is this government doing about that? Yet they put all the tenants, they put all the landlords, they put everybody in the same kettle and they say that everybody is the same. That is not the way you solve the problem, and we are not being given an opportunity to properly deal with that subject.

"The average rent in the province is in the order of \$550 per month," this report says. "Even in the most expensive market, Metropolitan Toronto, the average rents for bachelor, one-bedroom and two-bedroom apartments are \$456, \$556 and \$683 per month respectively." The report shows a number of schedules that state that.

I think we should be spending time on that. I think we should be spending time on what is a fair rent, what is a reasonable rent, for the people, the tenants of this province, to pay and what can they afford to pay, because that would assist us in how we are going to deal with the poor of this province. But no, we are not going to be allowed to do that. This resolution says: "That is it. You cannot talk about it any more."

The report goes on to say: "A rent of \$683 would require a gross annual salary of just under \$28,000 to stay within the 30%-of-income ceiling for housing expenditures. This is well under the average income of \$32,298 for an Ontario tenant family in 1989. The difference would be even greater if a 1990 figure for Toronto alone was available. Indeed, the income needed to afford an average-priced apartment in Toronto is below the Metropolitan Toronto Social Planning Council budget guideline for a family of four. And this is only the average rent, not the lowest level available."

When one looks at all this information, the problem is that it is a matter of poverty, but we are not being allowed to deal with that. Clearly, when we look at these facts that are being put forward to us, I think that we in this House, whether members of the government or members of the two opposition parties, have a right, under the democratic

process, to put forward some of these facts to try and persuade the government to change its mind on either implementing Bill 4 or indeed making amendments to Bill 4. But we are not being allowed to do that.

"Another measure of affordability is the average percentage of gross income spent on rent by tenants. Less than 17% according to the available data." That is the figure that is given, at least in this report. "Clearly, on the whole, tenants are not being priced out of apartments." Now that is the overall picture of tenants. There are clearly tenants that are, and I think that is the problem. The minister has got tunnel vision. He is looking at the whole problem, but he should be dealing specifically with the poor of this province. He is not doing that.

I question when these issues were raised at the committee level and they are being raised now that members of this government will not take that into consideration. They will not even consider amendments that have been made at the committee level, and I doubt if they would make it now. Surely we have the right to debate those matters and try to persuade the government members to change their minds, but we are not going to get that right if this resolution passes. We are not going to get that right.

"This is not to say"—the report goes on—"that there are not those with affordability problems. Almost one third of tenants spend more than 30% of their income on rent, not because their rents are too high but because their incomes are too low to afford even the most reasonable housing. These people are desperately in need of income assistance, something we will deal with at length."

Of course, they did deal with it at length, and I submit that we should be allowed to deal with it at length. I really do. We are talking one third of the renters of this province and they are being ignored by this government. They are preventing us, members of the opposition and presumably some of the backbenchers who speak occasionally, from discussing that subject. It is not going to get discussed. It is going to be slammed through this House. We will not get a chance to debate it, and I submit that we should.

Now they list a number of myths which, I submit, we should look at, and we should look at—

The Acting Speaker: Again, I feel it is necessary to draw your attention to 23(d) which says "reads unnecessarily from verbatim reports of the legislative debates or any other document." If you wish to move on, fine, keeping that in mind.

Mr Tilson: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I think that it illustrates the concern that I have that a number of these issues require a great deal of debate. I appreciate that in discussing the issues one can go beyond the resolution, but I am trying to list the issues that are not going to be adequately discussed. I will try to limit my discussions to those.

There was the issue raised by this government that very large rent increases, 100% and greater, are a common problem in this province. That has been stated over and over by the Minister of Housing and other members of this government. I submit that we have the right and the duty as members of the opposition to challenge them on that

statement, if that is one of the reasons why they are putting forward Bill 4. But we are not going to get that right. That myth is discussed in this report, and I will not read it all, but I do feel that I should read some of it to illustrate the concern as to why more time should be spent on that.

The report states:

"It is not surprising that this myth is widespread, since it is actively promoted by some elected officials, among others. On introduction of Bill 4, the minister referred to 100% rent increases on the very first page of his announcement. Tenant spokesmen have publicly claimed that thousands of tenants are being economically evicted by huge increases."

Now that is an issue that I believe deserves a great deal of debate. Is the minister exaggerating? If he is, we should hold him accountable, and we are not being able to hold him accountable because of the restrictive nature of this resolution. We are being shut down. We will not have that right.

The report states that dispassionate facts from the Ministry of Housing's own statistics tell quite a different story, and I believe we have the right to challenge the minister on that, to invite him and the Premier and the parliamentary assistant, because they are all the ones who have specifically raised this subject, to explain their actions, and we are not being given that right.

The Ministry of Housing's own statistics tell quite a different story. "Of Ontario's 1.2 million private rental units, in a given year more than 86% receive rent increases of under 5%. Less than 1% receive increases of 30% or more and only 7/100's of 1%—84 apartments out of 1.2 million—fall into the 100%-and-over category." Now, why can we not debate that? Why are we being shut down? Why can we not debate that, if that is the reason why Bill 4 is being introduced? Why can we not do that? Well, it will come to light why we cannot do it, and I think it is shameful.

The report goes on. It states that members will have been convinced that there are many thousands of apartments facing triple-digit rent increases each year. That has been put forward. Some of the speakers from the government have cited examples in their own ridings, even though the rent review statistics show no such increase in their entire region of this province for the last two years. Statements have been made. Why can we not as the opposition hold the government accountable for these statements? Why can we not challenge them on it? We are not being given the right to do that. That is how myths are created. That is how this government has created myths with respect to Bill 4.

1700

The report goes on to talk about large increases that are the result of greedy landlords ripping off the system. Now, that is true, there are some. But are all landlords like that? Is that what the members of the government are saying? Do they have facts to substantiate that? I believe that we should spend some time on that, because if it is being a responsible government, it cannot flippantly make statements like that and not expect to be held accountable. I do not see how the government could possibly do that. We have the right to hold them accountable, to ask them ques-

tions and to make statements to encourage them to say, "No, you are wrong," in which case they should allow amendments or withdraw the bill or vote against the bill. We have the right to do that.

"The few very large increases which do exist are almost always the result of a combination of at least two out of three important factors: extremely low base rents"—and I think we should spend some time on that. We have talked to some degree on that, but we should spend a great deal more time on that—"a requirement for extensive structural renovation due to age and deterioration, and small building size, often under 10 units.

"Why can we not discuss that? What is going to happen to these buildings? How are they going to be repaired? How are they going to be renovated? I do not know, because the landlords are saying they do not have the funds for it. I believe we have the right to question this government on why it is doing what it is doing.

The report goes on to state: "To anyone with an understanding of the system, the age and extent of repair factors would be obvious." You would think that with members of this government, who claim they are experienced, they would realize that.

The report states: "To anyone with an understanding of the system, the age and extent of repair factors would be obvious since to generate a very large increase in a building with average rents would essentially require reconstruction of the building." Facts have been presented on that.

We have had testimony from all walks of life and from all types of groups. I believe that unless all members of this government have studied those submissions very carefully, we have the right to emphasize and to summarize some of those reports that were given to us in committee, because it has a very serious effect on the economy of this province. But under this resolution, we are not being given that right.

They given an example, "To generate a 70% rent increase in a unit with a current rent of \$550 would require capital expenditures of at least \$30,000 per unit, equivalent to stripping the building to a shell and refurbishing." So what kind of game is the government playing over there?

Size is also a major consideration, and we should be discussing that: "Size is a major consideration if an expensive structural component must be replaced. A new roof on a six-plex may be half the size of the roof on a 60-unit high-rise, but since the costs cannot be as widely spread, the resulting rent increase will be five times as great."

I believe that we have the right to give examples with respect to this, and a number of examples, because obviously the examples that were put forward on the committee did not affect this government at all. We have the right—and I demand the right—to be heard. I demand the right to be heard and members of both opposition parties demand the right to be heard and not silenced by what the government is proposing to do.

They give an example of a type of situation generating a very large increase. They talk of a 14-unit building in Sudbury and Mrs. B. Carpenter. We have heard it to some extent at the committee level and I think it has been referred

to in this House. This is a 14-unit building in Sudbury and it is formerly owned by the municipality. I am giving this example because I believe that there should be a number of examples to show why the government should consent to amendments. If we have the time allocation that the government is suggesting, we will not have an opportunity to do that.

This building was formerly owned by the city of Sudbury. It was 75 years old and it was "desperately in need of major improvements, including a new roof, modern plumbing and new flooring to replace wood so rotten the ground showed through in several places."

Mrs Carpenter "borrowed money to complete this work and she filed for the rent increase to which she was entitled—some 150%. This is the type of situation in which some would automatically cry 'economic eviction'" I believe that we should spend a considerable amount of time on that and we should not be shut down and not allowed to talk about economic eviction. Yet the new rents after the increases in this particular building would have reached the staggering level of \$400 per month, still at least \$100 below market levels. That is the type of gouging that this government is referring to.

The summary goes on by stating, "Despite the fact that every bit of work which Mrs Carpenter completed was badly needed"—and again, we are talking about improving the quality of life of the tenants of this province and I believe we have the right to debate that and this resolution will not allow us to do that. The quality of life of the tenants of this province is deteriorating and will continue to deteriorate. All you have to do is to look at the slums of New York.

We had people come. One of the groups produced someone from Sweden and someone from New York to talk about rent controls in other jurisdictions and I believe that was not made available to the committee. I believe we should have the right to bring forward that information that was relayed to us, because only the parliamentary assistant from the government was present. There were not any other members of the government who even bothered to show up. One person from this government showed up to hear that very important piece of information in fact, that all of the members of this House should hear. I believe we have the right to bring that information forward, but we are not being allowed, as a result of this resolution.

Mrs Carpenter preserved, as the result of her work, "14 apartments which were otherwise quickly approaching the point of becoming uninhabitable," and both the city of Sudbury and the tenants all supported the work. They all supported it and they all supported the resulting increases. But Bill 4 says, "Tough, you can't do it." Why can we not discuss that? Why can we not debate that?

One should ask the Minister of Housing and ask the government House leader, because they have introduced a resolution that says we cannot.

The report goes on to say, "Clearly it is ludicrous to attack large increases without considering the rent level to which they are being applied." I have asked the Minister of Housing to produce his analysis, his impact studies to show why he is introducing this legislation. It has never

been produced. I think I received a letter that had half a page of figures. It really did not adequately put it forward. I believe we have the right to debate that. If he is not prepared to put forward his own impact analysis—the government has not studied this—I believe the opposition has the right through debate of Bill 4 to bring forward reports and facts that can show that this bill should not be implemented. We have that right, but we are being shut down by the government, because clearly it is going to show how foolish it is in implementing this legislation.

"In buildings with chronically depressed rents, necessary work may generate enormous percentage increases even though the resulting rents are still more than affordable."

In the case of one landlord, and I am referring to this report, the justified increase for one of his units would be 587%. Clearly I would agree and obviously members of the government agree—I think we would all agree—that this is outrageously excessive, and some would say, without considering that this was on a starting rent for a one-bedroom apartment of \$40.

I have example after example after example that I could bring to this House to show that the government is wrong in implementing Bill 4, dead wrong, but as a result of this resolution, we are not being allowed to do that. I believe that we should be allowed to discuss the myth that has been created by this government that capital improvements are just luxury renovations carried out to justify higher rents. That is a myth that this government has created. We have a right to challenge them either in the form of an amendment or in the form of debate. We have the right to challenge them. We have the right to state that that is just not the case.

1710

I am sure we could all provide examples. We have seen examples where luxury renovations were carried forward to justify higher rents, but I can assure the members that is not the trend across this province. That is not why we have the housing crisis that we do.

The report goes on and states that, "When asked what statistics were available on the impact of various types of capital work on rent increases, the response from the Ministry of Housing was that there were none." None. How are we going to hold the government accountable when we are not allowed to debate that?

"Rent review services does not keep records of application or orders containing claims for particular types of work. In other words, there is no factual basis for claims by the minister or anyone else that luxury renovations are a significant cause of rent increases." But we are not allowed to debate that.

There have clearly been a few, a very few, and I think we have the right to show what the information is that we have to state what those few are and to challenge the government to bring forth the vast number of examples that it has to show why it is stating that capital improvements are just luxury renovations carried on to justify higher rents. I believe that we have the right to ask them to do that, but we are not being allowed to do it.

"Certainly there have been a few, a very few, examples of landlords making what some might call questionable

improvements, but they are hardly significant." I believe that we should debate that. Because the government, because the Minister of Housing has made such a big deal of this subject, I believe we should spend time on it, that we should hold him and his government accountable for the statements that he has been making in this House. We are not being allowed to do that.

The report talks about a survey of the membership concerning the type of capital work that had been undertaken. "Not one owner had installed microwave ovens." That was a favourite trick. Remember that one, microwave ovens? "Two rent review consultants, whose clients collectively completed almost \$100 million worth of capital work this year, knew of only two buildings where either microwaves or dishwashers had been installed in buildings other than on a replacement basis."

Why can we not challenge the government on those facts? Why can we not challenge them on the myths that they are creating? We are not being allowed to debate that if this resolution carries. We are not being allowed to debate that.

"The rent increases generated by the so-called 'luxury renovations' are usually minor. Though 'marble lobbies' has become such a catchphrase for some, in a typical high-rise building the installation of marble panelling in the lobby would only add 0.6% to each unit's rent, or \$3.30 per month for the average apartment."

If the problem is that there have been abuses by certain landlords, surely you do not scrap the whole thing and surely you deal with those abusive landlords. Surely we are allowed to debate that. Surely we are allowed to challenge the government and say: "Are these the reasons? How can you deal with them? Do you scrap the legislation or do you take those individuals who are abusing the system and deal with them appropriately?" We are not being allowed to do that.

The report states, "Since marble flooring costs approximately 40% more than ceramic tile, but is ruled by the ministry to last 20 years as opposed to 10 years for ceramic, the use of marble may save tenants money." If the government is going to raise that subject, maybe we should be introducing facts that talk about that subject. Do you install some sort of capital expenditure that is going to break down after a year or do you put forward a capital expenditure that may last five years or indeed 10 years or 20 years?

We are not being allowed to produce facts. We can produce facts by representatives who were not allowed to come to the committee hearings. We can produce facts that challenge the statements made by the Minister of Housing. But we are not being allowed to do that by this resolution.

The report goes on to speak of the fact that, "The vast majority of capital improvements are both necessary and far from luxurious: concrete repairs to balconies and garages, replacement of plumbing risers, exterior cladding, roof repairs and replacement, electrical lighting upgrading, replacement of single-pane windows and so on."

Surely when we have had facts presented to us at the committee level that talk about how buildings are becoming unsafe because of certain conditions in buildings that

are 20 years or older, we have a right and surely the people of this province have a right to listen to debate on why these expenditures should be allowed. This government says, "Sure, we will allow them, but you can find the money from somewhere." They do not say where the money is going to come from. I suppose their public utility will deal with that. We are not being allowed to debate that subject either.

The report goes on to state: "The ministry has records on every application to rent review, including details of the type of capital work completed. If it was felt to be important, it would not be difficult to take a representative sample and separate how many include claims for 'luxury' components. The problem is, the government may not like the results."

They will not like the results that we are planning to introduce, and that is why they have introduced this resolution to shut us down. They are not allowing us to bring this information forward. Clearly we were not allowed at the committee level and we are not being allowed in this committee. I feel that the government is wrong in introducing this resolution to preclude us from bringing forward these facts, facts that I would hope would change its mind.

Another subject that we are not going to be allowed to debate is the myth that capital expenditures would not be required if landlords conducted regular maintenance. This was a subject that came up time and time again with the New Democratic members of the committee, who said that if landlords did their job properly we would not have the problems that we have now. I believe that we should have an opportunity to debate that. That should not go unchallenged. We should be allowed time to spend time on it. I would be interested in hearing facts.

Mr Winninger: Well said.

Mr Tilson: I hear a member over there say, "Well said." I would like him to debate that. I would like him to debate that fact. I would like the right to debate with him and I challenge him to debate that at any time.

The report goes on to say that, "This type of argument was typified by the member for Yorkview in his comments during the second reading debate that if major capital work is required on a building 'chances are it is because of neglect.'" That is what we heard during the committee hearings. We should spend some time on that, but this government does not want to talk about it. It has put forward a resolution that precludes us from debating statements that are made as little as two seconds ago by a member of this House, and we are not allowed to debate that.

"Such a statement ignores the reality that normal, day-to-day maintenance cannot stop the effects of age, weather and progressive deterioration. How can a landlord stop salt from rising in the atmosphere and corroding concrete balconies, or draining off cars and weakening garages?" We should spend time on that, and we have information. The Concrete Restoration Association of Ontario was given a limited time to make a presentation to the hearing. They have more information to present, but we are not being

allowed to present that information. Debate has been cut off because the government says, "Whatever you've got you should do in a day."

"How can a landlord stop salt from rising in the atmosphere and corroding concrete balconies, or draining off cars and weakening garages? How can she maintain appliances that are so old replacement parts are no longer available, or indefinitely patch boilers that break down continually after 20 years of service at internal temperatures of 1,000 degrees?"

1720

There is a landlord in my riding who has a building that is 20 years old. They have patched the roof and they have patched the roof. It needs immediate attention, they cannot patch it any more, but because of this bill, it cannot be repaired. The water is coming down and it is gradually moving down floor by floor, destroying people's apartments. Why can we not discuss that? Why can we not spend some time debating that? Why are we being restricted by this legislation from debating that?

"As manufacturers," the report goes on, "consulting engineers and standards associations all state, every building system has a specific life expectancy, beyond which maintenance becomes insufficient to address deterioration, impractical or uneconomic in comparison to replacement."

The report states that, "Sometimes components which still have some useful life remaining must be replaced because of changing regulatory standards."

We were allowed some time during the committee level to discuss that, but I think that is a recurring problem. Municipalities are continually changing their property standards bylaws, putting more and more requirements on landlords to improve their buildings. The requirements are coming from the health people, the fire people and all kinds of agencies in this government. Yet where are the landlords to get the moneys to do these things? Where are they going to do it?

I believe we have the right to debate that. I think it is required that we debate that, but this resolution says: "No, you can't debate it. You're given a day to put all four of your amendments and some debate." So we will not be able to produce information that we were unable to introduce at the public hearings, and of course we will not be able to introduce comments that were made by applicants or people who we were not able to hear, almost 100 of whom say they were not allowed to be heard.

The report goes on. It states that, "Sometimes components which still have some useful life remaining"—I referred to the regulations of municipalities and other such standards, and I deal specifically with balconies, the balcony railings. Municipalities are changing the heights because of the tragic accidents that are occurring. There is example after example where landlords are told, "Replace all the railings on your balconies because they're too low." Landlords have to do that (a) for the protection of the tenants and (b) because the law says it.

But we are not allowed to debate that. We are not going to be allowed to put forward and spend some time on amendments such as this and the hardships that are being put on landlords who are trying to meet the law of this

province and are trying to keep the situations of the tenants safe.

That deals with "garage and stairwell light upgrading, installation of smoke and fire alarms and so on." It goes on and on. How are landlords going to be able to maintain these requirements that are being forced on them by governments, and quite rightfully so, because standards do change? We should be allowed to debate those.

"These required changes have absolutely nothing to do with the landlord's standards of maintenance"—absolutely nothing.

So there are different categories that we need to spend some time on and we are not being allowed to spend some time on because of the time allocation motion that is being put forward by the House leader. We are not being allowed to do that at all. I submit that simply in the time that has been given we do not have the time to talk about the examples that are recurring and to show why we believe more amendments should be put forward to Bill 4 or indeed Bill 4 should be defeated.

The report goes on. It talks of, "All levels of government have recognized that provision for major capital improvements for buildings is essential to the long-term preservation of the existing affordable housing stock."

That is an important factor, and we need to spend time on that, but we cannot. The government is not allowing us to. They are putting forward a resolution, and sure, they have the votes for it. They can do whatever they like, unfortunately, and unfortunately we are going to—

Mr Cousens: It's an abuse of power, that's what it is.

Mr Tilson: It is an abuse of power, and unfortunately I hope this is not a sign of the future.

Interjections.

Mr Tilson: The report refers to the city of Toronto—

The Acting Speaker: Order. In all deference, I am finding it more and more difficult to hear the speaker, and I do believe it is some of your own colleagues who are making this difficult. I would ask that you allow the member to continue so that all of us can listen.

Mr Tilson: Members of my caucus are concerned with the fact that they are not able to debate this legislation. They are not being given the time, and it is very frustrating for us. We simply need more time and we are not being given the time that is needed to discuss these many issues that are being raised by Bill 4.

The Minister of Housing talks about Bill 4 as if it is a very simple bill that has no effect on our economy. I say it does, and I say that all members of our caucus and all members of the Liberal caucus and all members of the government caucus should have the right to debate these items, but we are not being allowed that right.

Specifically there is a report that was given by the city of Toronto's Preserve or Perish study, which was made in 1986. They made a point with respect to this subject that I would like to refer to. It is specifically an exhibit that was included in this report and it states:

"Though conservation may, in due course, cost hundreds of millions of dollars, it still appears to be the most economic method of maintaining the supply of affordable

rental housing.... The cost of conservation of existing buildings will be several times lower than the cost of replacing them by new ones, despite rent increases that may be required to offset the amortized cost of rehabilitation. Post-conservation rents in existing buildings will most likely still be substantially lower and more affordable than rents in new buildings."

This is a report from the city of Toronto.

Mr Stockwell: Can you understand? A socialist bastion.

Mr Tilson: That is right.

I believe all members of the government have the right to put forward information that we were unable to bring forward at the committee level. We are not being allowed to do that because of this resolution. This is one of them, and there will be others, but we are not going to be allowed to do that.

The report that I am referring to talks about a major study for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp, and they talked about the need for conservation for their current rental housing stock. They reached similar conclusions as the city of Toronto did, and they pointed out the direct link between successful conservation strategies and reasonable rent regulation. These are just two examples that I believe should be studied at length by this committee, but we are not being allowed to do that. The government says, "That's it."

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corp states, "As the rental housing stock in Canada ages and becomes obsolete, a significant increase will be needed in real spending on maintenance and upgrading. However, the extent to which this increased spending arises will largely be determined by the presence of rent controls through the 1990s, the provisions of these rent controls for allowable rent increases in older buildings and the rate of return allowed on renovation investments."

Bill 4 does not deal with that. Why can we not deal with it? Why can we not introduce amendments that would allow us to explain to the government that perhaps Bill 4 should be amended to alleviate this problem that it is creating? Why can we not do that?

The report goes on by saying that:

"Over 80% of Ontario's rental housing was constructed before 1975. Government studies have estimated that at least \$10 billion worth of capital investment is needed to conserve the existing stock."

Where is it going to come from? Clearly they are not going to allow the private enterprise people to do it.

"If landlords cannot make these investments," the report goes on, "because they will never be able to recover the funds they would have to borrow, there are only two choices: Either the work will not get done, to everyone's detriment, or the long-suffering taxpayers will pick up the bill."

The taxpayers will pick up the bill. I believe our party states that we are sick and tired of this government's intention to tax the people of this province even more. That is their plan, to make housing a public utility. They plan to

tax, tax, tax, and we have the right to debate that in this House, and this resolution precludes us from doing that.

Another myth which this government will not allow us to talk about, will not allow us to challenge because it has created another myth, is that, "Landlords don't need 'extra' money to do major repairs and renovations because this is provided for in the rents already."

Members of the New Democratic Party, the government members in committee repeatedly said that already: the landlords have got lots of money; that they have been ripping off the system, over and over and over, and they have got lots of money to do these capital expenditures. We have the right to debate that and challenge that. I would challenge the parliamentary assistant or the Minister of Housing or any other member to debate that fact they have been forwarding to us, because it is simply wrong, what they are saying is wrong. We have the right to debate that.

1730

"The formula for calculating the annual guideline includes provision for normal maintenance, defined as work such as snow removal, janitorial services and minor appliance repairs." I am reading from the report, of course. "It also contains a 1.0% increment for 'small capital,' meaning those items for which it is not realistic to apply to rent review because their total value will never generate a rent increase sufficient to overcome that 1.0% penalty for applying."

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: It is a bit too noisy. I cannot hear.

Mr Tilson: The report states: "There is no provision in the guideline for funding major capital." That is one of the major concerns that our party and I know the official opposition has with respect to this legislation. We expect and demand a substantial amount of time to debate that subject and we are not being given that time.

There is no provision in the bill for that. If there were, every tenant would be paying the cost regardless of whether capital improvements were actually conducted in his or her building. It was for this reason that during the development of the current rent review regime, the Bill 51 matters, that both tenants and landlord representatives endorse the concept of a separate justification system to provide for higher rent increases to fund capital improvements. Clearly, the system we had did not work. It needed improvement. But this government does not seem to care. They have one thing in mind. I think they are thinking of votes. That is all they are thinking about. I am not so sure they can go so high, but they are adding wrong, because they are forgetting how Bill 4 is going to have an unbelievably detrimental effect on the economy of this province. We in the opposition have the right to debate that and we are being prevented by this resolution.

The report goes on by giving an example which can show how normal rent increases cannot possibly finance capital improvements. I am referring, of course, to the statutory items that are being suggested in Bill 4. More time should be spent on this, but of course the government is

simply saying, "You've got a day to do everything, including this topic, and that's all you've got."

How can we adequately discuss this subject of how we are going to finance capital improvements in a day? How are we going to do that? "The mandatory upgrading of balcony railings in a building amortized over the lifetime of the component would generate a rent increase of 5.01% in a unit with the provincial average rent of \$550."

In other words, the report states that this single expenditure alone could more than consume the annual guideline rent increase, not even considering normal operating cost increases. So the whole subject of these rent increases that are being suggested by Bill 4 needs to be discussed, needs to be analysed. They certainly were not analysed at the committee level. We believe that we have the right and the obligation to bring information forward to challenge the government on those figures. They clearly picked those figures out of a hat.

I say that we need more time and the time allocation motion that is being submitted is insufficient. The report goes on and comments that, "An argument that is sometimes made is that landlords should be setting aside money each year for the time when capital work is required." That sounds reasonable and I think that was canvassed during the committee. I think we should spend some time at this debate discussing it, because considerable time was spent during the committee hearings on that and I believe that we should discuss it in this debate with respect to Bill 4, but we are not being allowed to as a result of this time allocation motion.

That would be a reasonable assumption if rents were unregulated at market levels. The report goes on to state that, "With artificially low rents, low profitability and no allowance in the guideline for increases to generate funds for this purpose, this approach simply is not realistic."

Mr Stockwell: That is an understatement. The whole party is not realistic.

Mr Tilson: This government thinks money grows on trees; it really does. I think we should be able to provide economic facts, because we were not allowed to during the hearings. We can get these facts but the government does not care. We repeatedly asked the Minister of Housing for an economic analysis but he would not produce it to us. The only time we have to do it is now.

We asked for experts to come to the committee levels, and the NDP said: "Sorry, we do not want to hear about that. We are only going to allow you three weeks." That is instead of the five weeks that were originally promised to us. Now is the time to introduce these facts but the government House leader's resolution says we cannot do that.

The report says, "A reserve fund approach has been advocated by a number of tenant organizations," and it has. I think we should spend some time on that because that was raised during the hearings. It may be necessary that this government, even for its moratorium period, consider an amendment. Maybe they do. But I think we should have an opportunity to debate that because of the issues that were raised during the hearings.

The report states:

"These groups do not seem to recognize that there is a huge difference between trying to establish a fund for a new structure like a condominium, with large upfront levies on the initial residents, compared with existing apartments with widely varying ages, capital needs, tenant profiles and existing rent levels."

That is not to mention that rent reserve levies would have to be twice as large due to the federal income tax treatment, and I am sure the government is considering that.

Why can we not debate it? Because we are not being allowed to. This time allocation motion says: "No, you are only given a day to debate any resolutions that are on the floor now, and if there are any other resolutions we are not going to debate them. We are not going to hear any more."

The report goes on to state, "Whether or not one believes this to be a reasonable alternative for the future, it is an incontrovertible fact that no such system has been in place in the past, nor have the higher rents needed to fund it been charged." We should spend some time on this subject, but we are not going to be allowed to.

The report gets into the subject of flipping. I believe, with the remarks that have been made by the minister and other government members in this House, in this committee, in and outside this House, that we should have an opportunity to challenge the members of this government on their statements when they say the flipping of apartment buildings has been a common occurrence which has been fuelling large rent increases. I believe we have the right to debate that, but this government says, "No, even though we have said it, we are not going to give you a chance to challenge us or to debate it."

The report says that although "the Ministry of Housing could easily develop the statistics if they were likely to be supportive of this case, they have never tried to do so." There have been some figures, but not to justify the facts we have been led to believe by the Minister of Housing.

The city of Toronto did conduct such a study in this jurisdiction where the large majority of abuses were alleged to have occurred, and clearly there was some flipping. Again, if flipping is the problem, perhaps legislation should be implemented to deal specifically with the flipping, to prevent the flipping. You do not stop the whole system, you do not cause the economic crisis that this bill is going to do. We should have the right to debate that, but this government says no.

There is another issue this government has raised. Members have stated that apartment owners do not need the rent increases for capital or for financing costs because these can be absorbed out of their excessive profits. I really challenge any member. I would love to debate that topic with this government because I do not think it has the facts to substantiate that. I think that is just a figment of their imagination and it is part of the big lie, it is part of the myth, the many myths that have been created as to why this terrible legislation has been introduced.

1740

The report talks about this, and I think that we have the right to bring that information forward, and other facts similar to it, to show that the government is wrong. It may

result in amendments to the bill. It may even result in the bill being withdrawn as a result of very concrete facts that have been presented to us and which we believe we could present to this House.

The report I am referring to goes on. It states: "Even in larger buildings with professional management, the returns are modest. In 1989, the Ministry of Housing commissioned a study to examine this issue. This study found that average returns on equity to investors in residential rental real estate decreased from 7.9% annually in 1970 to only 3.4% in 1989; that operating costs were substantially higher at the end of that period than at the outset; and that even when long-term capital gains are combined with short-term operating returns, profits are low."

We spent a great deal of time during the committee reports pleading with this government to allow us to bring economists in to discuss this subject, but we were denied that. This is the only forum that is left for us to deal with that, and yet, if this resolution is passed, we will not be able to do that. We will not be able to present those facts in the form of reports that would adequately explain the situation, because of the time allocation resolution.

The report goes on. It states, "Despite the popular perception that capital appreciation provides for major returns to owners when buildings are sold, this definitive report reached quite a different conclusion." Then they quote from that report, and I would like to read that, because this is the type of information that I believe members of our caucus, and I am sure the official opposition, could bring forward to show why Bill 4 is wrong and why amendments should be allowed and we should allow debate on that.

This quoted report talks about how: "Many people claim that while annual rates of return are low, capital gains offer long-term potential. However, this was not the case in the past 20 years. The residential rental market increased at a modest 6% to 8% average annual growth rate which, adjusted for inflation, translates to minimal or non-existent gains. Therefore, residential rental investors must be satisfied with low annual returns and relatively minimal capital gains."

This is not what the government has said as to why it brought forward Bill 4. These facts should be brought forward to this House to persuade the members of this government to change their minds. They are wrong, and these are facts that show they are wrong. The study clearly showed that for any investor, whether a small landlord trying to build a retirement nest-egg or a major corporation, the rental market did not perform nearly as well as the other investment markets.

We have referred at some length to that in this House. We have talked about Canada savings bonds, Treasury bills and other forms of real estate, and I did refer to the report of Royal LePage that says it does not pay. Now, I believe that more information could be brought forward by members of this House, but we are not being allowed that. We are not being allowed that by this resolution. We are not being allowed to bring forward any of these stats because we will not have time. We are only being given two days to bring the amendments, and only existing amend-

ments. We will not be allowed to bring any new amendments. We are only allowed two days to bring those amendments and debate these very important economic issues and to bring these economic facts to this House.

The report goes on by saying: "It is interesting to note that the NDP in the past several years supported the complaints of public sector unions that government-managed pension funds were being shortchanged by governments borrowing from these pools at less than market rates. If apartment investors were guaranteed even the insufficient returns offered by government...which the NDP was criticizing, they would be earning two to three times the rates the ministry study concluded they have been receiving."

That is an important fact. The whole issue of this matter is that there are many small landlords in this province whose whole purpose is to create a pension, and that is fair game for that, and you need those people. They are not abusing the system. There are no facts to put forward that these people are abusing the system. In the past, tenants and landlords in these situations have worked hand in hand. Clearly we have a very difficult economic situation, but that has all ended with this government, and I believe that we have the right to bring all that forward.

The report talked about evaluating the government's response. I think we should be doing that. I feel that members of the opposition—because we are certainly not going to hear from the government members to evaluate these myths and these situations that have been described by government ministers, the Premier and others. This report talked about this, that it is clear from this review of myth and reality in the rental sector that the rationale offered by the government for intervention was grossly exaggerated. I honestly believe we should have time to talk about that. Government ministers, the Premier: they simply cannot come forward and make these statements. They just cannot make them up. They have to have facts. We have asked for facts, and if they are not going to provide the facts, we will.

How are we going to do that with this time allocation motion that says we only have two days to do that? How and when are we going to be able to do it? Bill 4 will be passed and we will have no opportunity to adequately put forward new resolutions or to debate the resolutions that we feel we should be persuading the members of the government to approve.

For the sake of argument, the report goes on, it is accepted that something has to be done to address the limited problems with large rent increases and multiple sales of buildings. Clearly, we need to look at that. We need to look at the flips. We need to look at the abuses. There may be others that have not even been thought of. How can we do that when we are being put on a time restraint to debate these very important issues?

"Public policy has been defined as the legitimate use of coercion by government to achieve societal goals. The key here," the report emphasizes, "is 'legitimate,' which means far more than that the government must be duly constituted and that the goals must be just and defensible. It also means that the degree of coercion employed must be proportionate to the problem; that it be no greater than required to achieve

the stated goals; and that the decision for its use fairly balance societal interests with the rights and freedoms of individuals."

That is the whole question: the freedom of individuals. I do not think we have talked about that at all. I do not think we have talked about the freedom of the landlords, landlords who have played by the rules with the retroactive issue. They have listened to the government officials. They have renovated their buildings. They have gone and got loans or they have put mortgages on their homes.

Mr Stockwell: And they are out of luck.

Mr Tilson: That is right. They are out of luck. They are out of luck because of this government. I believe that we have the right and the obligation to talk about that, because the government has not been listening during the committee stage. This means that this committee is faced with determining whether the provisions of Bill 4 are fair. I have tried to raise that specifically with the parliamentary assistant, the Premier and the Minister of Housing. I would like to spend some more time on it, because I do not think this legislation is fair. I think we should be spending some time on it as to whether it is fair and whether it is legal.

We have legal opinions submitted to us, albeit for a landlord organization, that say that it is not legal. We know that there are some legal opinions flying around the government that the government will not produce and that we are trying to have produced through an appeal through the freedom of information process. We need time for that, but we are not being given time. Two days. That is it. We cannot discuss fairness. We cannot discuss legal matters and we cannot discuss "properly targeted" in proportion to the concerns the bill is alleged to be addressing. We are not allowed to do that at all.

With respect to retroactivity, that is a subject that we did spend some time discussing the current amendment that is before the House by the member for Eglinton.

"One of the simplest tests of fairness of a statute is to question"—this report states—"whether a law-abiding citizen could have been aware of a law to be capable of complying. It is fair for the state to say that as of tomorrow it is illegal to make a right turn at a red light, and it is the responsibility of all drivers to be aware of this change."

In other words, you have got to have a crystal ball in your head. I believe we should have the opportunity to debate that, but the motion before the House precludes us from adequately doing that. We should spend considerable time on the whole aspect of retroactivity, because we are seeing the subject of retroactivity creep into all of the legislation that this government is introducing.

1750

This report states that it is patently unfair for the state to say that this change is retroactive to last month and that because you made a red turn at that time, you will be penalized under the new law. Why can we not discuss that? We are clearly not being allowed to discuss that, because of this time restraint that is being placed on us by this government.

The report goes on to say:

"The latter"—that I have just illustrated—"is exactly the situation in which landlords find themselves today. They have obeyed the law as it was in the books and they have relied on the legislation to guide their investment decisions. In some cases, they have even received binding orders, government orders that authorize them to do what they are doing, from the government stating the rent increases to which they are entitled. Now they are being told that the rules have been changed after the fact and that such previously issued building orders on which they based business decisions are void."

Our party is more concerned about this issue than any other issue with respect to Bill 4, and we have not spent enough time on it. We have the right to debate that issue because of the unbelievable hardships that are being placed on the people of this province, the bankruptcies that are being caused and the jobs that are being lost. This report confirms that it is misleading to claim that the effective date of this legislation is 1 October 1990.

It is clearly misleading. In fact, the effects stretch back months and years before that time, both in the case of capital improvements and financial loss. We have spent some time on that fact. It is unbelievable that this government would introduce legislation that would in fact be retroactive years—not 1 October, not months, but years—where orders have been made to phase in payments over a number of years, because those are all void as a result of this legislation.

I believe we should put forward a number of examples, because they certainly did not listen during the hearings of this Legislature. They did not listen at all, and I believe that we have the right to submit those examples to this House in an attempt to persuade them to change their minds. This report says, "The capital improvement program on Rob Herman's 70-year-old building began in November 1989." I am referring to the report. This is one of several that I believe should be brought forward to the House. "Because the work involved a complete interior gutting and modernization of the interior as well as exterior upgrading, the work was spaced over a period of almost a year. Both the tenants and the city of Toronto supported the work." The city of Toronto and the tenants supported the work, and not only that, "The Ontario government provided financial assistance for what it considered a classic example of downtown, low-rise conservation." So you have the tenants, you have the Ontario government and you have the city of Toronto approving this. We believe that these are the types of examples that should be brought forward in debate, because this government will not listen.

The report goes on to describe what happened in this situation. It talks of the work being completed in the fall of 1990 and an application being filed in September for a rent increase effective April Fool's Day 1991. "However, under the new rules introduced by the NDP government, Rob's application is treated as falling under the moratorium date of 1 October 1990, even though workmen were on the site 11 months prior." Why can we not discuss situations like that? Why are we being cut off?

The report says: "Rob Herman's situation is not an isolated example. Of all applications filed as of 30 November 1990, there were 1,570 applications representing 91,405 units with effective dates for rent increases of 1 October or later. Every one of those examples represents an owner who initiated work in good faith from 3 to 12 months."

They acted in good faith; they believed in the province of Ontario—that was before the New Democratic government was elected—and were fully in accordance with the law as it stood but they will be arbitrarily shut out from ever recovering the money they spent. Because of this legislation, they are never going to recover it. Before they could recover it. That was then, and this is now. They cannot recover it. Why can we not discuss that? Why can we not discuss these problems?

In 275 of these cases the landlord actually had an order in hand before the legislation was even introduced. I believe—they will not listen to it in committee—that we should go through those applications to show how unfair this government is.

There is some question with respect to conditional orders. We did spend some time on conditional orders and I believe that more time should be spent on conditional orders because many people are going to be bankrupt and that is a subject that we, as an opposition, and I believe the government members, have an obligation to discuss.

This report talks about Joe Pemberton and four partners who together own a 20-unit building on Robina Avenue in Toronto. Mr Pemberton is a carpenter who was well aware of the need for major work in this 75-year-old building. So was the Ontario government.

Here is another example where even the Ontario government was aware of it and yet we are not allowed to list these examples and to try to persuade the government officials. We know what the Minister of Housing is doing, we know what the House leader is doing, we know what the parliamentary assistant is doing. They are not going to listen. Their ears are closed. But maybe there are some backbenchers back there who would be prepared to listen to some of these examples and to show the hardships that have been created by their bill.

Mr Pemberton is a carpenter by trade and "was well aware of the need for major work in this 75-year-old building. So was the Ontario government which provided assistance under the low-rise rehabilitation program for the required renovations." Joe and his partners are working people. They are working people of this province and they had to borrow against their own homes to raise the money required for this work.

They sought an advance ruling as an assurance that the money would be repaid over time from increased rents. "A conditional order was obtained in June 1990 for a 25% increase effective 1 January 1991. The new rents for the renovated units would still be affordable, ranging from \$440 to \$595 per month." These are the types of examples that we demand the right to bring to this House to discuss.

With his order from the government in his hand, Mr Pemberton mortgaged his house. He completed the work, "only to have a new government"—the New Democratic government came along—"which was not even elected until three months after he obtained his ruling change the rules on him. He and his partners are now trying to cope with a \$4,000-per-month carrying cost for his investment solely because of this government's reversal." There is still time. There is still time to debate in this House to try to persuade the government members to reverse their position to help the Joe Pembertons.

"There were approximately 50 other landlords who also had conditional orders and are caught in the same situation as Joe Pemberton." I demand the right to hear from these 50 other landlords because we certainly did not hear from them in committee. I want to hear from these people.

There is another topic that should be discussed and we are not given the opportunity to discuss it as a result of this time allocation motion. We are not being given the time. That has to do with the financial loss phase-in subject. The report talks about this and I would like to refer to it in some length.

The Deputy Speaker: Will the members take their seats, please?

The House adjourned at 1800.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward

Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson

Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Peter Kormos, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood

Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 16 April 1991

Members' statements

Assistance to Kurds	711
Mr Ruprecht	
Women's health services	711
Mrs Witmer	
Anti-recession program	711
Mr Perruzza	
Race relations	711
Mr Curling	
Child care	712
Mr Jackson	
Safe neighbourhood initiative	712
Mr Frankford	
Government's record	712
Mr McLean	
Community Justice Week	713
Mr Mills	

Statement by the ministry

Home sharing	713
Mr Cooke	

Responses

Home sharing	713
Mr Elston	
Mr Tilson	
Mr Jackson	

Oral questions

Doctors' fees	715
Mr Nixon	
Ms Gigantes	
Conflict of interest	716
Mr Scott	
Mr Rae	
Algoma Central Railway	717
Mr Harris	
Miss Martel	
Mr Rae	
Gerald Caplan	719
Mr Offer	
Mr Rae	

Transportation service for the disabled	719
Mrs Marland	
Mr Philip	
Social assistance	720
Mr Wiseman	
Ms Akande	
Garbage disposal	721
Mr Chiarelli	
Mrs Grier	
Mr Sorbara	
Social work	721
Mr Jackson	
Mr Rae	
Education financing	722
Mr Mills	
Mrs Boyd	
Assistance to farmers	723
Mrs Haslam	
Mr Buchanan	

First reading

Education Amendment Act (Electoral Quotients), 1991, Bill 72	723
Mr Tilson	
Agreed to	723

Government motion

Time allocation, motion 16	723
Mr Tilson	723
Adjourned	746

Other business

Visitors	712
Mr Callahan	
Visitors	713
The Speaker	
Gerald Caplan	720
Mr Offer	
Adjournment	746

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	747
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	750

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 16 avril 1991

Première lecture

Loi de 1991 modifiant La loi sur l'éducation (quotients électoraux), projet de loi 72	.723
M. Tilson	
Adoptée	.723

CA2 ON

X 1
D23

Education



18 1991

18 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 17 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 17 avril 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 17 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr J. Wilson: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I believe that my privileges as a member of provincial Parliament have been seriously abrogated as a result of the NDP cabinet's closed-door decision to remove the Queen of Canada from the oath of allegiance which has always been sworn by the members of Ontario's police forces.

This move on the part of the government seems to me to have profound implications for all those who have sworn an allegiance to the Queen and especially for members of the Ontario Legislature whose duty it is to uphold the laws of this province and to defend the privileges of the crown and Her Majesty's representative in Ontario.

It is in the name of the crown that I, as a member of provincial Parliament and as a member of this Legislature, exercise my rights and privileges on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Simcoe West and on behalf of the people of Ontario.

I believe the NDP's decision has great and far-reaching consequences for all aspects of our legal and legislative institutions in this province. I shudder to think how the Premier intends to stopgap the very many broad questions the public, the media and perhaps even the courts will raise in the aftermath of what I can only call the most regrettable political decision, made in direct opposition to our best-established constitutional traditions.

I strongly believe that the government's decision calls into question the very legitimacy of this Parliament, this cabinet and this Premier, because unlike in a republican system, unlike in the United States of America, our authority as parliamentarians is derived from the crown. It is on loan from the Queen herself. In fact, as a distinguished member of the media, Michael Valpy, points out in this morning's *Globe and Mail*: "Politicians exercise power only on sufferance. The power is on loan to them."

I want to quote from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada. In a state dinner on 26 June 1973 she states, when she talks about her role as the constitutional monarch of Canada:

"But it is as Queen of Canada that I am here, Queen of Canada and of all Canadians, not just of one or two ancestral strains. I want the crown to be seen as a symbol of national sovereignty belonging to all. It is not only a link between Commonwealth nations, but between Canadian citizens of every national origin and ancestry.

"The crown is an idea more than a person and I want the crown in Canada to represent everything that is best and most admired in the Canadian ideal. I will continue to do my best to make it so during my lifetime, and I hope you will all continue to give me your help in this task."

Finally, I would point out that this House, this Legislature is filled with symbols of the crown's authority. The

mace which lies before you, Mr Speaker, the office of Speaker itself, cabinet ministers, and indeed each and every member of this House are symbols of the crown. I, as a loyal subject of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, Queen of Canada, am deeply shocked and offended that the NDP government would attack the one remaining great symbol of Canadian unity and identity. God save the Queen.

The Speaker: To the member for Simcoe West, I appreciate the matter which you have brought to my attention and I will be pleased to report back to you as soon as I can.

Members' statements, the member for Quinte.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr H. O'Neil: My statement today is also on the same matter. I hope the Premier pays close attention to what was just stated and to what I have to say.

I rise today to protest the NDP's misguided decision to eliminate the oath of allegiance to the Queen for police officers across Ontario.

Our constitutional monarchy is the most important institution we have. Since the United Empire Loyalists came to Ontario from the United States more than 200 years ago, the monarchy has been a potent symbol of our provincial heritage.

Ontario's coat of arms reflects that heritage with the Latin motto that translates, "Loyal she began, loyal she remains." Our provincial flag depicts the Union Jack in the top left-hand corner, and our licence plates proudly depict the crown as the symbol of the people's authority over the government. The previous statement also mentioned many other areas. As Canada's head of state, Elizabeth II embodies centuries of tradition that have moulded the great country that we have today.

People flee oppression from all over the world to live in Ontario and participate in those traditions of freedom and opportunity. It is absurd for the NDP to suggest that newcomers to Canada object to the monarchy. They come here precisely because of the stable, tolerant society that is fostered by our constitutional monarchy.

Tens of thousands of Canadian soldiers have died fighting to preserve the way of life we have enjoyed under our system of government. They are remembered with great pride by all Ontarians, and particularly by members of the Royal Canadian Legion across Ontario who continue their fine tradition of also honouring the monarchy.

Our police officers put their lives—

The Speaker: Would the member for Quinte take his seat, please.

Mr H. O'Neil: I urge the Premier and the cabinet—

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat, please.

1340

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr Arnott: Today I want to call upon the government to review all regulations and legislation which affect small business in the province of Ontario. It is my opinion that the government should immediately strike a select committee on small business for this purpose.

Small business is the economic engine of this province, and a great deal needs to be done to support this vital sector of our economy. The government should be looking at ways to simplify existing regulations and legislation, to cut business taxes and eliminate the duplication in administrative government procedures and requirements, all of which inflict an unnecessary burden and financial cost on our small business operations.

This government has taken absolutely no initiative to solve the most fundamental economic problem facing Ontario's economy, which is its present inability to compete with neighbouring jurisdictions. So far the government's thrust in dealing with our serious competitiveness crisis has been to adopt superficial initiatives to cushion our economic decline. Instead, this government must undertake a well-developed strategy to reverse this decline by cutting taxes and excessive regulations to ensure the long-term viability of Ontario's small business sector.

I submit that this government is presently incapable of understanding what is needed. Maybe the work of a select committee would help to enlighten it.

ZYGMENT SOJKA

Mr Hansen: I rise today to draw the members' attention to Zygmunt Sojka, better known as Ziggy, who has recently been nominated for an Ontario Senior Achievement Award for his work to improve our environment.

In the early 1980s Ziggy's eyes were opened to the provincial government's attempts to build a toxic waste facility in Cayuga, along the Grand River. His knowledge of the river's annual flooding patterns told him that this was the wrong place for such a facility, so he actively fought against its development.

After the Ontario Waste Management Corp was established in 1982, with its mandate to establish a huge centralized waste facility in Niagara region, Ziggy got motivated to educate and recruit other environmentalists in the province to explore alternative methods of waste disposal. Ziggy then became actively involved with the West Lincoln Task Force Against Toxic Waste, Niagara Residents Against Toxic Waste Dumps and the Ontario Toxic Waste Research Coalition.

Ziggy realized that the only way to stop the OWMC proposal was through lobbying. As such, in 1987 he and other environmentalists formed an organization called Niagara Residents for Safe Toxic Waste Disposal. He started as vice-president and now is president of the association. Under the leadership of Ziggy, Niagara Residents for Safe Toxic Waste Disposal has participated in everything from parades to demonstrations. As well, the organization has

erected six billboards and set up many information sessions for the public at large.

Over the years Ziggy has volunteered thousands of hours of time and inspired many people to work to improve Ontario. This province is very fortunate to have such a dedicated individual working to save our environment.

ST CATHARINES STANDARD

Mr Bradley: This week is a very special one for the people of St Catharines as our community newspaper, the St Catharines Standard, is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

At a time when so many newspapers in our province are falling into the hands of newspaper chains, the Standard has retained its status as an independent daily with a distinct emphasis on community affairs. For this its publisher, Henry Burgoyne, should be commended.

The local emphasis and community involvement of the newspaper are best exemplified in the "Through the Sports Gate" column of Jack Gatecliff, who, as executive sports editor, has recounted for readers the sports exploits of thousands of St Catharines athletes and has provided encouragement and recognition to so many in our part of the province. Jack is part of a talented team of writers at the Standard who have received provincial and national recognition when newspaper awards have been presented each year and who have kept St Catharines residents well informed on the issues of the day.

The entire Standard team—writers and photographers whose work is seen by the public and those responsible for the printing and production of the paper, its distribution and advertising—can be justifiably proud of a century of service to the community, from the Standard's beginning under William Burgoyne 100 years ago to the publication of its collector's item, the Centennial Edition, on 21 April 1991.

Congratulations, Standard staff. St Catharines celebrates with you.

SOCIAL WORK

Mr Jackson: Yesterday I reminded the Premier that Ontario was the only province in Canada that did not regulate the profession of social work. In response to my question the Premier gave a rather glib answer, but it was not a straight answer, to the question as to when we can see a regulated social work act in this province. Yet before the election, in opposition, he could clearly state that a regulated act is an important way to prevent adverse psychological, physical and social consequences for Ontario consumers.

There are two victims of the Premier's inaction in the House here with us today. They attended a press conference earlier today. They are from the Kitchener-Waterloo area and they have received support from their member in the House, the member for Waterloo North. Both Rick and Laura are present, as I say, in the chamber today as living testimony to the fact that it is unacceptable that in Ontario any Tom, Dick or Mary can hang out a shingle that says, "I'm a social worker; I'm prepared to give counselling for marriage counselling, for psychological counselling, for sexual counselling," and so on. It is inappropriate that this

province persists in its inactivity, and I would like to quote the *Toronto Star* today which said "The public deserves protection. That can only be accomplished by regulation of qualified social workers" and that the Premier should keep his promise.

CANCER TREATMENT CENTRE

Ms S. Murdock: As members know, distances in northern Ontario make specialized medical treatment a luxury as well as a frightening experience. No longer will cancer patients in the north have to travel south for treatment, because last Friday the Northeastern Ontario Regional Cancer Treatment Centre in Sudbury held its official opening ceremonies.

We all know cancer as a devastating, debilitating disease and at such times contact with family and friends is more important than ever. The Northeastern Ontario Regional Cancer Treatment Centre will allow cancer patients to stay close to home for treatment and that is important at times, not only for the patient but also for the family. Our new state-of-the-art cancer centre provides patient consultation and treatment, counselling for patients and family members as well as nutritional counselling. It is estimated that it will serve almost 58,000 patients this year and it has already surpassed expectations in terms of service.

Four people have to be thanked for all the work that they have done, as well as the thousands of volunteers: Maureen LaCroix, who spearheaded it in 1972; Dr Bob Corringham, the director of the centre; George Walker, who is winning an Order of Ontario next month for the work he has done on this, and Gerry Loughheed Jr, who raised \$9.1 million as our contribution.

OSCAR DEXTER BROOKS

Ms Poole: It gives me great pleasure to rise today to celebrate the achievement of one of my constituents, Oscar Dexter Brooks, who joins us today in the members' gallery.

Mr Brooks's life, at every turn, has shown him to be an industrious and creative individual. He has had a lifetime of accomplishments and last weekend he added one more to the list. Oscar Brooks is this country's oldest recipient of a Canada Council grant. At the age of 82, he applied for a grant to write a book. Upon receiving the funding in 1989, he went out and bought himself a computer and in only four weeks learned how to use it. The result is his book called *Legs*, which was publicly launched on 13 April.

Oscar Brooks has a grade 7 education. He has been a labourer, a farm-hand and a union organizer. He has owned and operated his own business and served as a hockey coach and professional scout. His book, *Legs*, is the story of wanderlust, a tale of Oscar's memories of the 1920s, when he was a young man striking out on the open road. For 35 years, Oscar Brooks has had the dream that one day his book would be published. He is a living testament that dreams do come true.

I would ask members to join me in congratulating Oscar Dexter Brooks on his latest achievement, the publication of his book at age 84, and thank him for serving as an inspiration to all of us.

1350

BICYCLING POLICY

Mr Tilson: It has become obvious that the Ministry of Housing should be taking lessons about the consultation process from the Ministry of Transportation. Recently, the Ministry of Transportation announced that it will be holding public consultation in centres across the province to review the ministry's bicycling policy. For \$200,000, the Ministry of Transportation has hired a consulting engineering firm to survey 232 Ontario municipalities and to hold public meetings in five cities. No doubt, these public meetings will be conducted in an open and democratic fashion, where all relevant parties will have the opportunity to voice their concerns and opinions. The re-evaluation and formulation of the government's bicycling policy will of course reflect the true findings of these public hearings.

The senior project manager of the consulting firm has indicated that his firm will produce a pretty comprehensive look at cycling in the province. To do so, it will leave no stone unturned. It is this type of process that should have been applied to the Ministry of Housing's consultation process for Bill 4. It would appear that other government ministries are conscientious in following up on public policy regarding ministerial policy. The Ministry of Transportation study was apparently motivated by 32 letters received by the ministry last year. Yet the Ministry of Housing, which has been lobbying continuously since the introduction of Bill 4, fails to have such an enlightened approach to the consultation process.

The question remains, in light of how other ministries conduct public policy consultations, how can the Minister of Housing continue to justify his blatant neglect in addressing the multitude of voices concerned with the implications of Bill 4 which today still remain unheard?

LANDSLIDE IN SCARBOROUGH

Mr Owens: Yesterday afternoon I visited the site of the landslide which occurred in my Scarborough riding. This landslide took place on the Brimley Road, south of Kingston Road, section of the Scarborough Bluffs. I spoke to the local residents who were affected by the landslide and also further urged the year-round residents who live on the boats in Bluffers' Park that they should seriously consider leaving the location for reasons of safety.

I was impressed with the responses by the fire, ambulance, police and hydro services who managed to alleviate much of the danger by their quick and efficient actions. As I toured the site with Michael Price, commissioner of works and environment, as well as Jim Bamford, the 41 Division inspector, I was most impressed with the way that Scarborough residents had worked together to ensure a smoothly functioning emergency response. Special thanks should also be made to Jim McLellan, the Ashbridges Bay Yacht Club harbourmaster, who after my call promptly arranged three slips for boat residents to leave the area.

Attention will now focus on stabilizing the bluffs and a crack which has developed on the east side. Since the landslide occurred on the site of a former sanitary landfill, I have been in touch with the Ministry of the Environment

to ensure the safety of the fill which has been removed and trucked to other locations.

It is hoped that such an event will never occur again, but it is gratifying to know that the response team is in place and does work.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr H. O'Neil: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I understand that the Premier will be making a statement in a few moments. He has heard the concerns that have been expressed by the members on this side of the House concerning his recent announcement to eliminate the oath of allegiance to the Queen for police officers across Ontario, and I wonder if he would also make a statement concerning something where no one in this House or across the province has had any input.

The Speaker: The member will know that points of privilege are directed to the Speaker.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before continuing, members may wish to welcome to our gallery this afternoon a former member of the assembly, a former member for Lakeshore, Patrick Lawlor.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Hon Mr Rae: Yesterday, the member for St George-St David raised questions about certain members of my cabinet and their adherence to my conflict-of-interest guidelines.

As members know, the guidelines build on the Members' Conflict of Interest Act that governs all members of the Legislature and set out certain rules for cabinet members and parliamentary assistants in addition to those in the law.

When I released those guidelines last fall, I asked that they be referred to a standing committee for review by members of all parties. The committee held public hearings during the winter intersession, and I look forward to its report.

In the meantime, I have the responsibility to enforce those guidelines because the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, the Honourable Gregory T. Evans, is appropriately not involved in enforcing guidelines that are not part of the legislation.

Two members of the cabinet were mentioned yesterday as owning rental properties.

The first was the Minister of Citizenship who, with her husband, owns a two-storey building in her riding which she rents to one commercial and one residential tenant. Because of the commercial aspect of part of the building, I have asked her to now put that building into trust as is permitted by the guidelines.

The second was the Minister of Community and Social Services. She owned a residential rental property in Toronto and one eighth of a condominium unit in Oakville. The seven eighths are held by her husband and members of her family.

In my guidelines, following on Judge Evans's view that owning small amounts of rental property do not constitute a business interest, members of my cabinet and parliamentary assistants were permitted to continue to rent out rooms in their residences, rent apartments in their houses or own residential rental properties. Several do, including the Minister of Community and Social Services. I do not, nor does Judge Evans, consider this to put ministers in a conflict of interest.

As well, some own recreational properties, as indeed I do myself. This too is permitted under the law and the guidelines.

I want to stress that at no time did the ministers act improperly. The ministers made full disclosure of their properties. I accept responsibility for my news release of 2 April and I regret the error.

RESPONSES

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Scott: When the Premier was just Bob Rae and was in the business of heaping scorn on others who had responsibilities in government, he said this on 3 July 1986 as if he was speaking in the apostolic succession: "What difference does it make...what guidelines exist if the Premier is not prepared to do what is necessary to see that those guidelines are enforced?"

What we have today in this statement is a recognition, not that the ministers did wrong apparently, because they apparently made disclosure to the Premier, but that the Premier or the Premier's office granted them a private exemption which he did not disclose to the public as he undertook to do, or made an amendment to the regulations or to the guidelines which he did not disclose to the public at any time, or just ignored his obligation to enforce the whole thing.

Now the Premier has taken this responsibility on himself. He said that the press release in which he told the public and the media and the opposition parties that all was in order, that all ministers were in compliance, patently incorrect as events now show, was his fault.

I say to the Premier, he had better get a grip on his office. These are important responsibilities. These are his guidelines. This is a pedestal he has built for himself and upon which he has placed himself, and the people of Ontario, whether they approve of the guidelines or not, will expect him to do what he publicly has said he was doing.

Now the Premier has said he made a mistake. As a man of honour, I accept his word. I am not in the business of calling a Premier of the province a liar, no matter what political advantage may be found in that. I accept his word.

Mr Harnick: I read this with interest, what amounts to a three-paragraph statement that says virtually nothing. I do not think that the Premier even looked at the guidelines that he created when he wrote the statement. The statement is quite clear, or the guidelines are quite clear. It says: "Ministers are required to divest themselves of all business interests." Those are business interests, whether they are residential or whether they are commercial. They are business

interests. They earn income; income is declared; it is a business interest.

But even if the Premier does not want to admit that it is a business interest, why could he not, in his statement, tell us exactly what we have to know based on what the guidelines say? The guidelines say that all business interests must be divested except where the minister satisfies the Premier that the interest has been fully disclosed. I do not see this in the statement.

He says that they do not have to divest if undue hardship would be created. I do not see anything about undue hardship. He says that if you can retain the interest and it is not inconsistent with the public interest—I do not see anything about that in the statement. He says that the minister should give the appropriate undertaking to avoid a conflict in respect of the interest. Where are the undertakings? I do not see any undertakings. This thing is hooey.

1400

I will tell members something else. The statement also says that the Premier is now going to start putting things in trust. Well, he wrote this long letter, some five or six pages long, and he brought it to us at the standing committee on administration of justice and here is what he said about trust: "It is difficult to see how the blind trust is really a solution at all. Even setting aside the evidence at the Sinclair Stevens inquiry, it is hard, in conceptual terms, how generally blind a trust can be that is dealing with closely held family business." It seems that now the trust is back in vogue in this government.

The other interesting thing, and I just passed upon it when I found this lengthy letter was that we heard yesterday about Mr Caplan, the lobbyist paid by companies, and there is the idea that he may have some access to this government through his wife or otherwise. But the letter refers to the idea of a lobbyist as well. It states: "The question also arises as to whether those individuals who have made it their profession to lobby or influence government should not be registered and their activities defined by law. There are obvious definitional problems, but these have been faced up to in many jurisdictions and it has certainly been my experience in my eight years in politics that the amount and scope of lobbying has increased dramatically."

I do not see anything whatsoever about that in the statement. It is interesting that the Premier says he is following on Judge Evans's view that only small amounts of rental property do not constitute a business interest. I do not remember hearing that, quite frankly. I was there, but I do not remember hearing that.

The other thing the Premier is ignoring is the fact that Judge Evans said divestiture is draconian, that it is not necessary. It is convenient that the Premier is not going to deal with that and it is further interesting that this aspect is conveniently forgotten. I think that, if anything, this statement is not responsive to what was raised in this Legislature yesterday and it is appalling that we cannot get the answers based on the Premier's own guidelines.

Mr Sterling: I would just like to add one more thing. I find it passing strange that on page 1 the Premier correctly

says the Honourable Greg Evans has nothing to do with these guidelines, but on page 2 he refers back to the same individual to build his case on what a business is or is not. It seems very inconsistent in terms of what he is trying to do in justifying two ministers who have not lived within his guidelines.

ORAL QUESTIONS

CHILD CARE

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. In January, right at the end of the month, she announced \$52.8 million in funding for our child care programs in Ontario, and in the announcement she said that part of that, \$30 million, would be provided to enhance salaries only in the non-profit sector, quoting her, "recognizing their current low wages."

Statistics from the ministry indicate that the salaries in commercial centres are approximately \$15,000 a year and in the non-profit sector average \$18,000 a year, both, I would say, inadequate and both needing correction. Can the minister explain to the House why the government has decided not to provide even a part of that additional funding for the commercial sector of day care, which is associated with fully 34% of the services provided.

Hon Ms Akande: Actually, of course, this government, like the previous government, has stated a preference for non-profit child care. It has the opportunity to have community boards, to have parents sit on those boards and therefore to bring their influence to bear on the kinds of programs that are implemented within the child care centres.

It also has a system where the books are open, and therefore the non-profit child care is totally accountable to that community and to those people who use that centre, which is, of course, another way of effecting the decisions of parents around the programs in those centres. Therefore, for that reason, we have found that government funds would be more appropriately used at this time to give a down payment on pay equity for the workers within those child care centres.

Mr Nixon: The difference in the situation, which the minister well knows, is that the previous government did provide funding for commercial child care, with the understanding that there was not enough money in the Treasury to simply replace it with the non-profit which, the minister knows, operates at a substantially higher cost.

I am not sure whether the policy of the government is simply to treat the profit-making or commercial child care centres as if they were the kulaks of the child care industry, but apparently the honourable minister is unaware that her policy has forced the closure already of approximately 18 commercial enterprises in Metropolitan Toronto. Last Saturday in my constituency office I was presented with information from people involved in the commercial child care sector in Brantford and Brant county, with the situation they face, which is similar, which really will inhibit the possibility of continuing their service.

What plans does the minister have, recognizing that the full replacement of commercial with her kind of child

care—non-profit, government operated—is relatively more expensive and would be an additional \$780 million a year, to see that the communities are going to be provided with this service until the nirvana she envisages is achieved?

Hon Ms Akande: Once again, I do not accept the premise upon which the member's question is based. First of all, I am quite aware that the previous government provided only 50% of the direct operating grants to centres that were in place by December 1987. That is only 50% of the direct operating grants. To all other commercial centres that came in after that time, there were not operating grants presented. So the premise that the previous government did fund the commercial sector is in fact not correct.

The other thing that I would like to say is that certainly it would not be—

Interjections.

The Chair: I realize that this topic brings with it quite a few different questions.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition is patiently waiting to ask his question. There are a number of other questions, I take it, and perhaps members would wait until they are called upon to actually ask those questions. Had you completed your response?

Hon Ms Akande: No, I had not.

The Speaker: Perhaps the minister could incorporate other details when the supplementary comes forward.

Hon Ms Akande: I will be that courteous to the member.

1410

Mr Nixon: My supplementary is normally based on the minister's answer, but failing the completion of her answer, I will have to refer to some notes in this regard. Rather than have a debate about the funding, she would know that we maintained the viability of the commercial service. The federal government's reducing of its support in this regard did apply pressure, but we did not.

The honourable minister, I sense, is under perhaps unusual and probably unwelcome pressure, from her point of view, from some of her more advanced colleagues in this regard. She must be aware that it is her responsibility to see that day care services are provided, and even if the provision of funding for the commercial aspects runs against the grain of some of her colleagues, she knows that at least this service is excellent and well-inspected and that we cannot get along without it.

I think the concern, really, here is that the minister's program was late in being announced and it meant that a number of municipalities could not accept even the service and assistance that she proffered because their budgets were already complete. I think Peel region is a case in point, where welfare case loads have grown by over 90%. It has notified the ministry that it is not in a position to take advantage of the additional 243 subsidized spaces because it cannot raise its 20% of the amount.

The subsidy announcement has come too late for many municipalities to take advantage of it because of the re-

strictions on their budgets in this yearly process. Waterloo region is a case in point, where welfare services and case loads have grown by 80% and the unemployment levels have soared to 12%.

The management in this regard is the responsibility of the minister. Can she explain what she is going to do to correct what surely is a mistake in applying this undue and deleterious pressure to the day care system, and what she is going to do to apply proper funding and to make up for the damage that she has already caused?

Hon Ms Akande: Let me assure the member that I am very aware of my responsibilities and very responsible to operate in this area. The ministry staff has always monitored the service that is provided by the child care operations and offered support where we were in danger of losing the services of those particular facilities, because it is our interest and our determined responsibility to provide sufficient child care in this province and to provide it at a cost which promotes us to pass the subsidies to people.

It was many of these municipalities which informed us that they required subsidies, so in response to their needs and their demands and the needs and demands of the parents, we did in fact pass those subsidies to the municipalities. Many of them have picked them up and are beginning to pass them to those clients. We have continued to assist municipalities in many ways in order to make those subsidies available and we are still working at the table to do that, to offer to the municipalities the help they need to serve our and their clientele.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Scott: I have a question for the Premier. It is sooner or later going to be the case that the Premier will have to come clean on the subject of the guidelines. His statement today did not do that and I hope in question period, in the interests of his government and in the interests of the public, he will do so.

As he knows, because presumably he wrote them, his guidelines require all ministers to divest themselves "of any assets which cause or could appear to cause a conflict of interest and all business interests, except where the Premier has granted a publicly expressed exemption with the reasons therefor."

Yesterday I referred to the case of two ministers. I made plain that there were others, but I was not able to document that they had failed in divestment. The Premier very capably just responded to the two cases. I really want to ask him today about the case of the Minister of Transportation.

The Minister of Transportation has declared that he has assets from which he receives income or which represent a business and, according to a search of title, has apparently not divested himself of those assets. Has an exemption been given? Is an exemption going to be given? What is the story here? Do we have to pull these teeth one by one, or are we going to get an answer about whether this Premier is prepared to enforce his guidelines, Rae's rules? What about the Minister of Transportation? We will deal with the others in time.

Hon Mr Rae: I am sure the member will. I have given to the member who has asked the question a statement, a

copy of a memorandum that I sent to members of the cabinet, caucus and parliamentary assistants, dated 12 February.

Mr Scott: But not to the press or the opposition or anyone else.

Hon Mr Rae: The substance of the document was fully discussed with people. I want to say to the member that I have shared a copy with him and I will share a copy with the House. I should also say to him that I made it very clear in that statement, as I did today with respect to the statement that I made in the House, which I will simply quote again to him:

"In my guidelines, following on Judge Evans's view"—which he has expressed again—the member is shaking his head.

Mr Scott: It won't wash.

Hon Mr Rae: He says it will not wash. All I am saying to him is, Judge Evans's view is that owning small amounts of rental property does not in fact constitute a business interest. I have also stated very explicitly, on 12 February, if the member wants, with respect to the clarification:

"I will say that I will then allow to be held as assets property consisting of a single-family dwelling, condominium or other such dwelling in addition to an owner-occupied dwelling. This in no way affects the prohibition of members acquiring an interest in land in Ontario except for personal residential or recreational use or where there is an existing farm or additional working farm land."

The situation of the Minister of Transportation is covered explicitly by the 12 February memorandum, which deals directly with this question. The former Attorney General should know that. He says, "When are we going to come clean?" I would suggest to him that while mistakes may be made, we have made it very clear what the rules are, as clear as we possibly can. If I may suggest to the member, and he knows full well, the guidelines which we have laid down and the rules which we have established are clearer and tougher than any introduced by his government or any introduced by the previous government. I think the rules are very clear indeed.

Mr Scott: The Premier is not going to get through this impasse by heaping ridicule on me. I am not the issue here. I am a private member. The issue is, as the Premier has said on previous occasions, whether he has the political will to enforce his own guidelines. Now what does he say in answer? Every member of the House and you, Mr Speaker, will want to understand this:

"I held a session of the Legislature, announced the guidelines to the public, took all the kudos from the press, circulated copies to them, had them printed in the papers and then on 12 February I sent a notice to my caucus which in substance says: 'Don't worry about all those guidelines. You won't have to do all the things that are in them. I didn't tell the press. I didn't tell the Legislature. We have it from Judge Evans.'"

1420

He did not tell him, and now he allows these private guidelines to excuse the divestment requirement of his own publicly released guidelines. That is the state we are at. There is nobody outside the Premier's caucus who has

seen this amendment. It is addressed to them; it is not addressed to us. There is no member of the press who has ever seen it.

The question I want to ask the Premier is this: His guidelines say that when an exemption is permitted so that an income-producing asset does not have to be divested, that asset shall be placed in trust under section 8 of the Members' Conflict of Interest Act. Those are the Premier's words.

The Minister of Citizenship has been required to put her asset in trust and, I understand, has done so. The Minister of Community and Social Services, who owns an income-producing asset, a building on Avenue Road which is rented—I know because I phoned and spoke to the tenant, Robin Taylor of the CBC—and which has a mortgage interest of \$320,000, is not required to be put in trust under section 8.

Why is the Minister of Citizenship required to put her asset, which is trivial by comparison, in trust and the Minister of Community and Social Services is not required to put her asset in trust? Why have a guideline that says you "shall" put it into trust if you do not mean "shall"?

Hon Mr Rae: To put it as simply as I can, because I have understood Judge Evans's view to be, with respect—

Interjections.

The Speaker: There was rapt attention to the question, and I assume that those who asked the question want to hear a reply.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Oh, the members do not wish to hear a reply. That is fine.

Hon Mr Rae: I will just try and repeat the answer as clearly as I can, simply because the view has been expressed to me that this kind of holding does not constitute a business interest as it has been defined by the person who is given the responsibility for interpreting the conflict-of-interest guidelines.

I say to the member that obviously we feel the rules that have been established are fair, they are open. The holdings that members have are open or are a matter of record. If the members want to know anything about our financial affairs, all that information has been disclosed fully to Judge Evans and it has all been made fully available.

Mr Scott: I have given one quotation from the Premier when he was plain Bob Rae and thought he could impose standards on others that he did not have to live with himself. Here is another: "One of the things we would like to see is certainty of enforcement. This is not a problem with the guidelines; it is a problem of political will." I repeat that to the new Bob Rae who is the Premier of Ontario.

He issued his guidelines. He made a great public display of it. Our staff went around today to the Premier's office and asked for the most up-to-date copy of the guidelines with any amendments that there were, as any member of the press or public might do. What did we get? We got the guidelines the Premier read so solemnly and so unctuously—I know he does not like the word—in the House.

Now what are we produced? We are produced a memo, dated 12 February, which goes to the cabinet—I do not get that—which goes to parliamentary assistants—I do not get that—and to the NDP caucus—we do not get that either. What that says basically is:

"I'm going to make some changes in these rules that I announced so you won't have to do all the things we said to the public and the press that you would have to do. Ed and everybody else won't have to actually divest. We said that but we're not going to actually ask you to do it. Now, don't tell anybody, don't put this before the parliamentary committee, don't tell the media and for God's sake don't tell the opposition and that troublesome guy who is getting under my spurs all the time, the member for St George-St David, because he will only ask a question about it."

If the Premier is making changes to the guidelines, if he is changing, as he has said, the exemption provision, if he is changing the divestment provision, if he is changing for the Minister of Community and Social Services the trust provision, if he is changing any or all of those things, will he please take the guidelines away, rewrite them and bring back guidelines to the House that he is actually in fact, from day to day, prepared to enforce for himself and his colleagues. All this paper being shipped into the press gallery, which has nothing to do with reality, will do us no good. When is the Premier going to introduce his new, complete, revised, unabridged, up-to-date guidelines with an asterisk, "These are the ones I will actually enforce"? When is that going to happen?

Hon Mr Rae: I am at something of a disadvantage because the member for St George-St David has said, on the one hand, that he wants to know what are the rules or what are the criteria that I use or that are developed in order to deal with the question of divestment. I tell him what they are and I show him where and when I said it, and the member then says, "Well, that's not good enough."

Mr Scott: I say it is secret. Tell the public.

Hon Mr Rae: The member for St George-St David, I think, knows better than to get quite as exercised as he appears to be getting. I would simply say to the member first of all, in answer to the second half of his question, he will know full well that I asked the committee and—

Mr Elston: Blame the committee.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I am not blaming it on anybody.

Mr Elston: Yes, you are. If Judge Evans is not enough, the committee will do.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I went to the committee in the middle of February. I spoke to the committee at that time. I said to them that I was interested in their advice, interested in hearing their advice with respect to new legislation.

My own personal view, and I expressed this view to the committee in the middle of February, is that additional legislation would be a good idea. I hope the committee will share that view. I will be very interested in seeing whether the members of the opposition parties and members of my own party feel that stronger guidelines are needed with respect to members of the cabinet. I look forward to hearing the views of the member for St George-St David with respect to what the law should be.

My views are very clear. They have been made clear in the statement that I made in December and in the statement that I made on 12 February, which indicated to members the criteria that I was going to be applying with respect to requiring divestment of rental property. I made it clear at that point that I felt that to require the divestment of rental property, in light of market conditions, would cause undue hardship. I stated that explicitly in the memorandum and I said further that it could not be considered to be, in technical terms, a business interest.

1430

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr Harris: My question is for the Premier. We are not a republic. We are not governed by a republican system of government. Whether the Premier and his cabinet like it or not, we as Canadians live in a constitutional monarchy. That is why I am deeply offended by what I consider to be an underhanded, secret decision—with no debate, no discussion—that was taken by his cabinet to replace the oath of allegiance to the Queen by police officers in this province. I would ask the Premier if this House is to interpret his cabinet's decision as an objection to Canada's status as a constitutional monarchy.

Hon Mr Rae: I first of all want to say to the leader of the third party that as the Premier of this province, I feel very strongly that the oaths which have been proposed in regulation and put forward by regulation with respect to new members of the OPP—let's see what it says. It says that whoever is taking the oath will swear that they will be loyal to Canada and that they will uphold the Constitution of Canada. The Constitution of Canada provides for a country, under the patriated Constitution, in which the Queen is the head of state of Canada and the Constitution provides for a clear constitutional monarchy. It is very clear that in expressing—

Mrs Cunningham: Stand up for what you believe in. You may have to say it out loud.

Mr Stockwell: Stand up for what you believe in. Name the multicultural groups that asked you.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I am beginning to wonder if there is something in the water.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Important, serious questions are raised, and I take it that when you ask a question, you wish to hear a response.

Mr Bradley: Not that kind of response.

The Speaker: We may not like the responses we hear and we may not like the questions we hear, but we still have a right to both hear the questions and the responses. If we would now just settle a bit, the Premier can continue.

Hon Mr Rae: Perhaps I could continue, and say to the leader of the third party that the fact that we had a new Police Act, which was passed in the previous Parliament and proclaimed in this Parliament, meant that a new regulation had to be brought forward. It is the view of the government—obviously we are listening very carefully to

the views that are being expressed, but I would say to the leader of the third party that we regard an oath in which the person who is swearing the oath swears that he will be loyal to Canada, as that he will uphold the Constitution of Canada, very clearly accepting the Constitution of the country and all that that entails, including, obviously, our continued loyalty as citizens of the country to Her Majesty the Queen.

Mr Harris: The Premier in his response said "proposed." Perhaps he could explain whether "proposed" means that we are going to have some debate on this, as we have not had before. The Premier also mentioned the new Police Act. He will recall, I hope, our party's strong objection to the fact that we did not see any of the regulations when we dealt with this act. I would ask him to explain "proposed," if he is going to allow some debate on this regulation or if in fact it is a fait accompli.

As well, I want to suggest and point out to the Premier that the decision strikes at the heart of Ontario's justice system. Police forces are sworn to uphold the law of the crown. Charges are laid and prosecuted by the crown. Sentences are determined by the crown. If the police no longer swear allegiance to the crown, in whose name are they acting? Is it the Premier's? Is it Brian Mulroney's? Is it some politician?

Mr Runciman: Is it Bob Rae?

Mr Harris: Is it the Premier? Surely if they are to be prosecuted by the crown, if the sentences are to be determined by the crown, police forces should be sworn to uphold the law of the crown.

Hon Mr Rae: I think the honourable member is stating that there is some conflict between the words "Canada" and "the crown," or that there is some conflict between the Constitution of Canada and the crown. I do not accept for a moment that when one takes an oath to Canada, the reality—when one takes an oath to Canada, one is taking an oath to the Queen. When one takes an oath to the Constitution of Canada and when one states one's loyalty to the Constitution of Canada, we are taking our oath to all that includes and implies, and that is precisely what we have done. The notion that people would somehow, in choosing Canada, be doing offence to Her Majesty the Queen is an illogical idea. The logical idea is that in choosing Canada we are choosing the very best of our traditions, which includes the monarchy.

Mr Harris: I would like to quote from today's *Globe and Mail* where it says: "The politicians exercise power only on sufferance. The power is on loan to them. Thus an oath of allegiance to the Queen is a vow of allegiance to the people themselves"—not the government of Canada, not the government of Ontario, but the people themselves, through one person who represents that, one titular head, if you like, the Queen—"and to all laws enacted in the Queen's name—but never to the country's political authority."

I swore allegiance to the crown when I took my place in this chamber; so did the Premier. In fact, I have a picture right here of him swearing that allegiance. The allegiance that the Premier swore to enact the laws was, "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her

Majesty Queen Elizabeth II," and then he would enact laws and we would empower police officers to uphold those. Now the police are going to have to be resworn. Does the Premier expect members of this chamber to be resworn?

Hon Mr Rae: No, of course not, and the member knows that. He knows it full well.

Since he quoted from Mr Valpy's column, let me again ask the member to listen to the words of the oath which police officers are going to be swearing, "swear that I will be loyal to Canada"—not the government of Canada, not to any political leader, but to the country called Canada, whose head of state is the Queen, the Queen of Canada—"and that I will uphold the Constitution of Canada"—not the government of Canada, not the government of Ontario, not the Premier of Ontario, but the Constitution of Canada.

The leader of the third party may see a conflict between the monarchy and the Constitution of Canada. This government sees absolutely no conflict in that regard.

1440

Mr Harris: My second question as well is to the Premier. He sees no difference, but many people do see a difference, including the police officers of this province, including the hundreds of phone calls that are coming in to my office and continue to come even as I speak. If he sees no change, why then did he make the change under the regulation?

Hon Mr Rae: When the Constitution was patriated in 1981, we dropped the words "British North America Act" and we accepted the fact that we had a Canadian Constitution in which it was clearly understood by everyone that the head of state was the Queen. I believe that when you swear allegiance to the country, when you swear allegiance to the Constitution of the country—

Mr Stockwell: To the Queen; so say it.

Hon Mr Rae: —there should be no question in anyone's mind as to exactly what that means. It means that one is swearing allegiance to the country, to its institutions, to its Constitution, as well as to the Queen, as the member for Etobicoke West said.

Mr Harris: This morning my office contacted the public affairs department of the Metropolitan Toronto Police. We were advised by the constable we spoke with that in his 30 years with the force, not one constable has refused to take the oath. To the best of his knowledge, the police department has not been lobbied by any community, by any ethnic organization, to have the oath changed.

Will the Premier not come forth with us, stand in his place and admit that this decision is a crass attempt on the part of the government to avoid embarrassing his personal choice as chair of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board?

Hon Mr Rae: I am happy to tell the leader of the third party categorically that it has absolutely nothing to do with that at all.

Mr Eves: Oh, you are changing all the other oaths then.

Mr Harris: All the other oaths are going to be changed; is this what he is implying?

I think the Premier's answer really does test the credibility of every single person in this province. I gave him an opportunity to come forth with what is obviously obvious.

Let me ask the Premier this: Ontario's tradition is dictated by its relationship with the crown. Here in this venerable institution, we hold the Lieutenant Governor in high esteem as the crown's representative. This building itself is known, I suggest not for a very odd reason, as Queen's Park. Take a short walk up the street to the Royal Ontario Museum.

By no means do I question the cultural diversity of Canada's many communities, but the Premier is jeopardizing the very foundation upon which this country was built, upon which this province is governed. We know we were promised a change when the Premier took over. Will he tell this House if he meant by that change that he promised to wipe clean the slate of Ontario's heritage?

Hon Mr Rae: I hope the member for Nipissing, the leader of the third party, would know me well enough to know the profound respect that I have—

Interjections.

The Speaker: You did not think I would stand?

Interjections.

The Speaker: Oh, I can tell, you are now waiting patiently to hear the answer and you would like me to sit down. Okay. Premier?

Hon Mr Rae: I hope we would never see the day when one would think that by swearing an oath to Canada, one was in any way expressing any form of disloyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. The most profound expression to the Queen of Canada that one could express is to swear that one will be loyal to Canada and that one will uphold the Constitution of Canada.

CONDUCT OF PREMIER'S STAFF

Mr Mahoney: My question also is to the Premier, and frankly this question would be almost funny if the incident were not so despicable. I understand that the Premier has a number of rather new, inexperienced people in his caucus, in his cabinet and on his staff, but I have sent him a copy of a letter that is addressed to the Toronto Sun from a Mrs Ruth Wiche. Mrs Wiche tells of the incident and I will just read this. It has to do with the demonstration of landlords, trades, business persons, workers and tenants opposing Bill 4 that was conducted in front of this building. She says:

"During the speeches of the opposition leaders, the Honourable Mike Harris, Liberal MPP Dianne Poole and representatives of trades and commerce, an obscene male stood from the second-floor window (the Premier's office), dropped his trousers and mocked the taxpayers below with his bare bottom."

Hon Ms Gigantes: Oh!

Mr Mahoney: The Minister of Health does not think it is disgusting?

Mr Elston: She thinks it's funny.

Hon Ms Gigantes: I don't believe it.

Mr Mahoney: I think it is pretty disgusting. She goes on to say:

"This kind of disgusting conduct shows a total lack of respect and illustrates the contempt toward the taxpayers who indeed foot all the bills. Further, it proves to me that Mr Bob Rae, our Premier, has very immature, ignorant people on his staff, with which he tries to govern this province. How disgraceful to use our House of Parliament for such foul behaviour."

She says other things in the letter, but that is basically the bottom line.

[Laughter]

Mr Mahoney: Well, members can laugh. I do not find this funny at all. I hope the Premier does not.

Is the Premier aware of the incident, has he identified the individual involved and what disciplinary action has he taken?

Hon Mr Rae: To answer the member's question very directly, the first I heard of this incident was when the member very kindly sent me over a copy of the letter which is directed to the Toronto Sun and of which a copy was addressed to me. I had not seen this letter.

The allegation is of conduct. I would share the writer's view when she says "How shameful," followed by four exclamation marks. I would certainly share that view. All I can say is that this is the first I have heard of it. It is an allegation that comes right out of the blue as far as I am concerned. I do not know what window it was, I do not know who it was or where it was, I do not even know whether it happened or whether there were any other people who saw it. All I know is that this is the first I have seen of it, and there were a number of people at the demonstration as well as a number of cameras. I will obviously have to consider the nature of Mrs Wiche's allegation and precisely what she thinks she saw.

Mr Mahoney: I would like a little more definitive answer from the Premier. We have a government that talks about banning sexist ads in beer commercials and even gets a cabinet minister fired for talking about that; yet the allegation would suggest a new level of conduct in government in dealing with legitimate protesters in front of this building.

We have talked to the lady who has made the complaint and we have strong assurance that indeed it did happen. In fact, the Premier has a member on his staff who has shown a disgusting level of respect, or lack thereof, for the taxpayers and the people demonstrating. I would like to know from the Premier, number one, will he thoroughly—

Hon Mr Cooke: Who is it?

Mr Mahoney: I am asking the Premier to find out.

Interjections.

1450

The Speaker: This appears to be a day where very few people are happy. The member is entitled to ask his question without interference.

Mr Mahoney: I am delighted that the backbenchers think this is a joke and not of any serious concern. I am

sure if the Premier finds out in his investigation that there is truth in these allegations, then he should be ashamed of himself. I hope he will investigate the matter, and if he does indeed identify the individual, I hope he will fire him. Will he fire him if he finds out who it is?

Hon Mr Rae: Before we jump to any conclusions, let's find out what happened. I will certainly endeavour obviously, in light of this letter and in light of the question that has been asked—it is a very serious allegation with respect to conduct, and I certainly share the view that it would be shameful. She says she saw something from the second floor-window, and then she says the Premier's office. Well, the only person in the Premier's office on that corner—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: I have started the investigation and I have ruled out one suspect.

Let me say quite seriously to the member that this is obviously a serious allegation. He was the one who said in the House that it was a member of my staff. He said that in his second question. I think that is a bit of a leap from the letter. I do not know what window, I do not know where and I do not know who. All I can say is obviously I will make inquiries, and when I have an answer, I will deliver an answer to the member. I just say how much I appreciate the question.

HUNTING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr McLean: My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Will he finally release the Algonquin Park management plan that he has been holding since the fall of 1990, and does he agree with the position paper on Algonquin Park and the Golden Lake band that was sent to him by the Federation of Ontario Naturalists on 8 April 1991?

Hon Mr Wildman: As the member will know, we have received the plan and it is under review. It will be sent out for comment, and when we receive those comments back, we will be acting on them. We will be sharing in the decision-making through consultation with many groups, including the group that he mentioned.

In response to the second question that the member asked with regard to the Golden Lake band, we have consulted widely with many groups, as I have indicated in the House, including the group he mentioned. We are taking their views into account in the discussions with the Algonquins, and we hope to have the interim subagreements completed and announced publicly by the end of this month.

We are looking forward to further consultation as we proceed in negotiating the land claim, as we have indicated, which we hope to begin by 15 June. We have invited the federal government to participate. It is very important that all interested groups be involved and that we have input from them. We value their views.

Mr McLean: I thought the consulting process had been done with regard to the master plan. I thought it was completed and it was ready. The minister tells me he is now still consulting. Perhaps he should tell this House when he deems that the consulting process is going to be

completed and when we are going to have the plan. I have sent over to the minister a copy of a photograph that was taken in Algonquin Park in 1955. This is a photo of a very young fellow feeding a deer by hand. Will we see this kind of park activity continuing in the future after the minister has finished with his native claim negotiations?

Hon Mr Wildman: I notice that the very handsome young fellow feeding a deer in the park is somewhat lighter than he is today.

This kind of activity, which I do not think is advised, feeding deer in the park, is something that could certainly be continued, although I would not advise it. As the member will know, the subagreements we are negotiating now will include in them times and seasons when hunting activity will take place, remote areas of the park where hunting will take place, the prohibition of the use of certain types of vehicles, the protection of conservation, total numbers of allocations and the protection of public safety. I am sure that the observation of wildlife and the interaction with wildlife will be able to continue.

I want to point out one other matter, in closing. Since this picture was taken in 1955, approximately the time the two townships in the southern end of the park were added to the park, the member will know that the hunting of deer in those two townships has always been allowed in Algonquin Park.

ONTARIO PRODUCE

Mrs MacKinnon: My question today is to the honourable Minister of Agriculture and Food. As an MPP who represents a border area, I have constituents who travel many miles to buy food in the USA. Farmers in my riding of Lambton tell me that if more were done to promote Ontario food, some of this cross-border shopping could be stopped. This is also the theme I heard as a member of the agricultural finance review committee. Could the Minister of Agriculture and Food say if he intends to act on recommendation 7 in the agricultural finance review committee report, which calls for initiatives to raise the consumer awareness of Ontario food?

Hon Mr Buchanan: Let me first of all thank the member for serving on that finance review committee and spending a number of hours on that committee. The member raises a concern around one of the recommendations, which is to spend money or raise consumer awareness. We certainly intend to do as much as we can in that area. The Foodland Ontario advertising campaign will be getting under way very soon and will be a very aggressive campaign. It will stress the freshness and the importance of purchasing Ontario produce.

The budget for that advertising and promotional campaign is about \$5.5 million. We are going to be very aggressive in promoting Ontario agricultural products because we think in doing that we will be helping agriculture. We will also be helping to cut down on the problem of cross-border shopping.

Mrs MacKinnon: I thank the minister for his answer. In addition to consumer initiatives, can the minister say whether he intends to do anything to raise the overall

awareness of urban people about farmers in the agricultural sector.

Hon Mr Buchanan: Yes. I would like the member to know that I believe agriculture in the classroom as an initiative is very important. We will be putting more emphasis on it and we will be stressing that initiative to make sure our urban cousins are more aware of the importance of agriculture and the importance of purchasing Ontario-grown food, both fresh and processed.

We are also looking to work with industry and the private sector to see what initiatives we can do in co-operation with and working with them to promote to the general public the importance of agriculture in the economy of Ontario, and we look forward to that kind of co-operation in the future.

1500

HUNTING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr Ramsay: My question today is to the Minister of Natural Resources. It is not about the deer that are being fed there; it is about the moose that he is allowing to be killed in Algonquin Park.

With regard to his withdrawal of the fish and game charges against the Algonquin band of Golden Lake, the minister recently wrote a letter to the editor that appeared in many of the Ottawa Valley newspapers. I would like to quote from that letter. The minister stated, "In future, charges will only be commenced against the members of the Golden Lake band for hunting in Algonquin Park if the activity poses a threat to conservation or public safety." Does the minister still stand by this statement and, if so, what is his definition of "conservation?"

Hon Mr Wildman: The agreements that we are negotiating, after consultation with groups like the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters and the Friends of Algonquin Park, will be based on the determination of the size of the herds and what the moose herd can sustain.

The member will know that a few years ago the Ministry of Natural Resources determined that there were so many moose in Algonquin Park that it could afford to transfer moose to the state of Michigan in exchange for wild turkeys. So there is evidence that the moose herd can sustain a significant amount of hunting.

However, there have been suggestions raised by some scientists that there may not be as good reproduction in the moose herd in Algonquin Park as we originally thought, and we have indicated to the scientist involved that we would be interested in his becoming involved in research to determine whether in fact that is the case. But right now there will be limits set, probably between 80 and 100 moose. That would be at the top limit that the Algonquins could take.

Mr Ramsay: I am very concerned about the data the minister quotes, because he quoted some old data. Now he is starting to say that recent studies are starting to question the viability of the herd in the park. As the minister knows, Dr John Taberge, a world-renowned biologist, has recently completed a report that now says moose hunting is not viable. I would like to quote from that. He says in his

report, "Moose hunting adds another stress disturbance of unknown long-term consequence to the Algonquin large mammal system, and thus from a biological perspective, I recommend against moose hunting by anyone in Algonquin Park."

This data that has been financed by the Ministry of Natural Resources and the World Wildlife Fund is shared widely. It really goes against what the minister is saying and looking at in his subagreement with the Algonquin band that the band may harvest, if you will, up to 80 to 100 moose. So we have to question the minister's conservation ethic.

If one looks at those numbers, and I would ask the minister to do that, this could be eliminating up to 19% of the moose herd in the eastern sector of the park. I would ask the minister, I would implore the minister with the revelation of this new data, would he please revise his kill figures for moose in Algonquin Park.

Hon Mr Wildman: Discussions with regard to conservation are ongoing; they are not static. The decisions from one year to another with regard to the numbers of tags allowed for the moose hunt outside of the parks of Ontario are determined on the basis of ongoing data collection and analysis, and that will continue and that will apply in this case as well. The member should know that we have had discussions with Professor Taberge. He has indicated his figures are preliminary, and we have indicated to him that we would finance further studies on his part which would be helpful to us in this exercise.

I just finally say that the member will know that for some time there has been a subagreement on deer hunting with the Algonquins of Golden Lake which set a limit of 175 that could be taken. As we have best determined, they took no more than 60 last year. There is no evidence that the Algonquins have abused the rights they have been given.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMITÉ PERMANENT DE L'ADMINISTRATION DE LA JUSTICE

Mr White from the standing committee on administration of justice presented the following report and moved its adoption:

M. White du Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice présente le rapport suivant et propose son adoption :

Your committee begs to report the following bill, as amended:

Bill 17, An Act to amend the Law related to the Enforcement of Support and Custody Orders.

Projet de loi 17, Loi portant modification des lois relatives à l'exécution d'ordonnances alimentaires et de garde d'enfants.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Bill ordered for third reading.

Le projet de loi devra passer à l'étape de troisième lecture.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

JOHN GRAVES SIMCOE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION REPEAL ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 ABROGEANT LA LOI INTITULÉE THE JOHN GRAVES SIMCOE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION ACT

Mr Marchese moved first reading of Bill 73, An Act to repeal The John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation Act, 1965.

M. Marchese propose la première lecture du projet de loi 73, Loi portant abrogation de la loi intitulée The John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Marchese: The repeal of this act is an administrative matter. The John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation was created by an act of this House and received royal assent in 1965. The foundation was given the mandate of preserving Wolford Chapel in Devon, England, the burial place of John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, and his wife.

By the early 1980s the income generated by the John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation's assets was insufficient to ensure the preservation, maintenance and repair of Wolford Chapel. The Ontario Heritage Foundation, on behalf of the people of Ontario, was requested to assist in ensuring the preservation of the chapel. At the John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation's request, the Ontario Heritage Foundation assumed responsibility for all known John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation assets and liabilities in 1982.

Among the assets transferred to the Ontario Heritage Foundation was title to Wolford Chapel, the Simcoes' burial place. As part of the transfer the Ontario Heritage Foundation agreed to preserve the chapel in perpetuity.

The Speaker: Normal procedure is to simply read the introduction to the bill, which I believe you have already accomplished.

Hon Mr Marchese: It was only my intent to give some background so that the members would understand.

1510

ORDERS OF THE DAY

TIME ALLOCATION

Resuming the adjourned debate on government notice of motion number 16 on time allocation in relation to Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Mr Tilson: We spent some time yesterday with respect to our concerns about the lack of debate that we have felt, at least on this side of the House, that we have had with the issue of the unfairness of retroactivity and the need to spend more time on that. Clearly this resolution before the House will preclude us from exploring more alternatives to that or indeed persuading the government to

withdraw that portion of the bill. As well, we discussed at some length the issue of the legality of the bill and our concerns about the constitutionality of that question.

There was a further point that I believe has not been adequately explored in the committee hearings, nor in this House, a point that was raised by the Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario. That had to do with the subject of proportionality. Clearly if this resolution carries we will not be able to deal with the question as to whether the means which are employed in this bill are proportionate to the ends which the government is seeking to achieve.

Just as a comment on that, I would like to refer to this report by this organization because this is a subject that clearly needs to be explored, particularly with the whole issue of the concern not only of the government, but of the Progressive Conservative Party on the bureaucracy created as a result of Bill 51. Our concern, of course, is that they are going to be replacing one bureaucracy with another. In this day of recession and a continuing increase of taxes, if this resolution is carried we will not be allowed to deal with that. In other words, we feel it must be determined whether there are alternative, more narrowly targeted approaches which could achieve the desired purpose without regulatory overkill and I would believe that the government is trying to do that.

The Fair organization made a statement in its report which I would like to refer to on this subject: "These questions are important regardless of whether the law is retroactive or purely prospective. The removal of retroactivity would address one set of concerns, but there would remain the issue of utilizing an approach balanced in relation to the need.

"In simple terms, the government has an obligation not to use a neutron bomb to destroy a gnat."

That is, of course, what this government is attempting to do, and we believe through the parliamentary process we have the right to debate further and to deal with that subject.

The report goes on by saying, "That we are indeed dealing with gnats here is clear" from the statistics referred to. "If, as the government has said, the intention is to eliminate 'flipping,' which they have never shown to be a significant problem, and large rent increases, which are equally uncommon, then this bill very definitely takes the neutron bomb approach."

I dealt with that yesterday, the whole subject of flipping, and the subject of large rent increases. Clearly, this government has very flippantly dealt with it and I know on this side we want further time to canvass this whole subject.

Mr Speaker, I do not believe we have a quorum. Mr Speaker?

The Deputy Speaker: I wish some members sometimes would respond to the same call when I ask them to follow the orders and remain on topic. A quorum is present.

Mr Tilson: One subject, of course, on which we spent some time at the committee level and on which we feel further time should be spent in this House, and which this resolution will preclude us from dealing with, is with respect to the subject of financial loss.

The bill simply removes any provision whatsoever that we have had with respect to financial loss, rather than to try to address the issue of flips or multiple sales. The Fair report does go into that and talks about how a small investor who has owned a building for 30 years and wants to sell to recoup his retirement savings is treated exactly the same as a speculator selling the same building for the fourth time in a year, if such an example exists.

The report goes on to say:

"It is not difficult to estimate the impact of this change on the value of apartments, both by direct observation in the marketplace and by economic analysis... The unarguable conclusion is that this bill will devalue residential rental buildings by at least 26% to 30%, indiscriminate of whether the building has ever been sold before. Thousands of individual small investors will see their retirement savings slashed to correct a minor problem of which they have never been part."

Because of that fact, and we had a considerable number of presentations made to us, I believe we should be able to present more of that information and try and persuade the government to reverse its position. This resolution, of course, precludes us from doing that.

The report goes on to say that this does not have to be the case; what the government is doing does not have to be the case. In other words:

"If the government is concerned about the small number of building flips which they constantly cite, it would not be difficult to address this problem directly. The speculation tax which formed part of the NDP election platform would itself remove any incentive to sell a building in less than five years."

Of course, that is one issue I am sure they canvassed and I hope they do not pursue that. But on the other hand, "A simple regulatory change under the Residential Rent Regulation Act could achieve the same goal for whatever period of time was felt reasonable."

The report goes on:

"Indeed, new regulations introduced last spring had already removed any possibility of alleged fix and flip practices by discounting the allowance for capital improvements if a building is sold within five years after a rent increase for capital is granted."

Now, we did not canvass that in the committee. We did not canvass that fact, and I believe that we should have an opportunity to debate that subject there, the fact that regulations were introduced last spring. With this resolution we will be precluded from doing that.

The report goes on:

"We are not only dealing with a gnat here; it is a phantom gnat. In the case of capital improvements, the same sort of overkill is readily apparent. If the need is, in the words of the Minister of Housing 'to stabilize the market'—and those were his words—"by restricting large rent increases while a new system is developed, that could be easily accomplished without cutting off all capital improvements as this bill would do."

That of course is our second concern. We have dealt considerably with the issue of retroactivity but this whole subject, the fact that capital expenditure is completely re-

moved from the bill, is the overkill that we should be spending more time in debating as a result of the introduction of Bill 4, and the resolution that has been introduced precludes us from doing that.

The report goes on with respect to the issue of the effects of Bill 4. I think that is something that we have really never had an opportunity to speak of. I know the member for York Mills introduced a resolution at the committee to ask the Trust Companies Association of Canada to come to the committee to give a presentation on the financial aspects of this bill, and that was turned down as a result of the NDP majority on the committee.

I am sure that members of this House—I know the member for York Mills specifically—would like an opportunity to debate that subject and perhaps provide information to the House to show the effect on the economy that this bill has, but we will be precluded from doing that.

The report says if Bill 4 is passed, every Ontarian will suffer to some degree as a result. They list some of the things. I think this list should be elaborated on by further debate in this House. They talk about the quality of building stock that will deteriorate. They talk about how jobs will be lost. They talk about how investments will decline, regardless of how the government might dismiss such warnings.

One of the great introductions to this bill was made by the Minister of Housing. He talked about how he was going to save the tenants of this province. Clearly we agree with him, except the difficulty is that he has not done anything for that 30% of tenants that I have referred to who cannot afford any increase. Nothing has been done. We want time to debate that because this government has no interest in the tenants of this province and we on this side do.

This report asks why any tenant should be concerned about this bill when it may save him some money on rent. If I were a tenant, and I am, and it would save me money, I would be quite pleased with that as well. "The simple reason is that landlords will be unable to provide the quality of accommodation which tenants deserve." Members have to look at that and I think we need to debate that. Yes, there will be some saved money, there will not be any increases other than the statutory increases, but we have to look at the other effects. We have not adequately debated that.

1520

The report comments:

"When a major building system needs replacing, the landlord will have to patch it up as best he can. Even if he wants to replace it, he will not be able to borrow the money, since financial institutions will be well aware that there will be no increase in revenue to repay the loan."

That subject needs to be canvassed. We need to go into a great deal of detail with that, if anything, simply to protect the quality of life of the tenant in this province.

The report speaks further on the impact of Bill 4 with respect to tenants and it says another result of Bill 4 will be a greater degree of tenant inconvenience.

"A leaky roof which needs replacement"—and I referred to that as an example in my own riding—"can be

patched for another season, but the chances of further leakage and resultant damage to personal goods and other building systems like plaster walls is significant. Ultimately, the costs will be that much greater if further deterioration and subsidiary problems result."

In many cases, we cannot wait for this moratorium period to end. The people of this province need to have capital improvements made to their buildings, because clearly the landlords do not have the money to do it under the system that is devised by this government. We need to debate that and we are not being given the time to debate that by the resolution put forward by the government House leader.

We had a presentation made to us at one of the hearings on concrete rehabilitation, and this report deals with that. I think that is a separate subject that needs to be debated further, and we are not being given time by this resolution to do that. Concrete rehabilitation, as I am sure members know, is a result of salt corrosion in garages, as referred to in this report, and balconies. It is probably the largest single category of capital improvement today. That is what we heard in the hearings and, certainly if any members have received letters, that is one of the major issues that has been dealt with. We are not dealing with it in this House; we are simply glossing over it.

This report talks about this type of work:

"An additional year or two of deterioration while the government ponders its alternatives will mean bigger bills down the line when further concrete flaking and corrosion penetration into reinforcing rods and supports has occurred."

We cannot wait while this government waits another two years. We cannot wait and we need time to debate that now, to point out to this government that we cannot wait. We need to deal with capital improvements now; we cannot wait for two years down the line to deal with that. The buildings are falling apart.

This report continues with this whole subject by saying that, "There is also a substantial element of paternalism in the bill in that capital increases are not to be allowed even where tenants have agreed to or even requested the work." They give an example. I submit that we should be allowed to give these examples and we are not being allowed to do this as a result of this resolution.

The report refers to "landlords like Jim Buirds, who agreed to perform \$3,865 worth of renovations in one tenant's unit at the tenant's request and with his approval." He cannot recover that money. He did it at the tenant's request, he did it willingly and it has been done, but he cannot recover it. "Nor in the future will any tenant be able to request improvements in his own suite and pay the cost through a small increase in rent." This bill will not allow that and we should be allowed to bring to this House examples such as the Jim Buirds situation and hopefully be allowed to persuade the government to allow amendments to its bill or to indeed even revoke or withdraw it.

These people are the very people whom this legislation, as alleged by the members of the government, is supposed to be protecting but is not protecting. If the government had listened to the hearings which had gone on

throughout this province, which we conducted in various cities and here in this House, in this Legislative Building, it would not be taking the position it is, so obviously it has not heard anything. Because they have not heard anything we on this side have the right to bring forward further examples to hopefully get them to change their minds.

The report says that this bill also will not help tenants who collectively support improvements in their building to be able to have this work undertaken "despite their willingness to pay the resulting increases." They refer to another example at 1000 Huron Street in London. In that specific situation, all 56 tenants signed a letter to the Premier. The report quotes that and I would like to read that into the record to show the type of problems we have that this government is ignoring and to show that we need to bring this information to this House to hopefully get the government to change its mind.

The letter to the Premier states:

"We recently had the leaky roof replaced, new carpets installed in all apartments, new counter tops and taps, new hall carpets and a beautiful new lobby installed... All of the work was carried out in a proper and legal fashion, all tenants in our building were agreeable to a 17% increase in rent, which our landlord legitimately applied for. We are now led to understand that you, sir,"—of course that is the Premier—"are not going to grant our landlord his increase in rent, and we would suggest that you rethink this decision."

We on this side of the House want the right to ask this government to rethink its situation because clearly it needs to hear more examples.

One of the items that the Minister of Housing specifically seems to be flippant about is the problem of job loss. We have spent some time on that, but obviously more time needs to be spent than was spent in the committee. This time allocation resolution clearly will not allow us to introduce further amendments or indeed debate that whole subject, which is one of the many issues that this bill affects.

The report talks about the issue of job loss and it says:

"One of the most amazing statements in the public debate so far has been"—the minister's—"remark that no jobs have been lost as a result of this proposed legislation. To say to the workers who protested at Queen's Park that they were losing their jobs as a result of the recession is ludicrous" It is ludicrous. Can members imagine the Minister of Housing saying that Bill 4 has no effect on the job loss when he sees contracts have been cancelled, he hears example after example of contracts that have been cancelled, contracts, even work that was in the middle of process that was being done, and that work has been cancelled?

"They had contracts for work on 28 November and these were cancelled on 29 November." Facts have been introduced to our committee to give that. There can be no doubt about the cause of job loss and yet this government, because of this resolution put forward by the House leader, does not want to hear any more information, any more facts to be presented with respect to job loss.

The report continues and talks further with respect to job loss, and that has to do with representatives of the renovation industry. They told the minister, "This is not a

particularly recession-sensitive industry." I am referring specifically to the renovation industry. Buildings in this province; When you have 75% of them that are 20 years old or more, that is exactly the type of industry that is needed. We need to spend some time on that and we are not being allowed to do that.

The report goes on to emphasize the fact that this renovation "work is important and the need for it does not disappear with an economic downturn." We do have an economic downturn. Hopefully, we are turning the corner, but we need to have our buildings renovated. We need to have the quality of the life of the tenants improved and maintained.

The report states: "While landlords have greater collection problems in tight times, they are not impacted to nearly the same degree as manufacturing or retail sales, since people still need places to live. Thus, they tend to carry on their necessary work program regardless."

The Fair Rental Policy Organization continues by stating: "It is readily apparent that Bill 4 will put an end to virtually all capital improvements in apartments for the period it is in effect. Already, landlords have put a halt to work that was in progress, since they will now be unable to attain increased revenues to pay for this work. This had already begun even before Bill 4 was introduced, once the new government had made it clear that they intended to proceed in this direction."

1530

The organization put forward a survey of its membership and it looked to the "overall population of the landlords" and "calculated that \$500 million in work had been suspended." That is a lot of money and we need to debate that effect on our economy, the effect on the apartment industry, but this resolution precludes us from doing that.

It said "that \$500 million in work had been suspended, putting more than 16,000 jobs among suppliers, contractors and trades at risk," and the organization put forward statistics in a chart, which presumably members of the committee have shown to all members. The Minister of Housing was questioned with respect to this information, and I think he should be further questioned by this House, but the resolution precludes us from doing that.

"The Minister of Housing has criticized this total, stating that only \$122 million has ever been ordered in a given year." He referred specifically to 1989. "However," this report states, "what has been ordered is substantially less than what landlords applied for, since there are still thousands of applications backlogged with the ministry." They are still there. They are just sitting there, because naturally this government has said, "Well, they are all going to be void anyway, so don't worry about them." We want the right to debate that, and we are not being given the right to debate that.

"As well, capital applications have been increasing every year as landlords became more familiar with the system and comfortable that it was not going to be changed without warning." That is the important issue: change without warning. There is nothing wrong with government changing a system. There is nothing wrong with changing a system, but surely they are going to give their

constituents and the people of this province some warning as to what they are going to do. But there is no warning given, and this resolution precludes us from doing that.

This resolution of time allocation: Two days is certainly not enough to deal with this subject and the many other subjects that I have been referring to.

Dealing specifically with renovation work, the report continues by saying it is "extremely labour intensive." The Fair organization states: "Clayton Research Associates has calculated that for every 1,000 direct jobs created by renovation work, an additional 840 indirect and induced jobs are generated. Thus it is not only the jobs of concrete workers, window installers, carpenters, plasterers, etc, which are at stake; it is also the employment of a whole host of others in many different parts of the Ontario economy."

That is one of the problems that we have in this province. We need to talk about the job loss. Yet this government, by introducing this motion, precludes us from spending sufficient time in debate to deal with that or indeed to introduce new amendments that would perhaps provide some solution to it.

I have referred to the effect on financial institutions and how Bill 4 has serious implications for those financial institutions. Again, I emphasize the fact that the committee certainly did not have the sufficient information that was required to study that whole matter. I believe that members on this side, and the government members if they wish, should have the right to submit further facts to this House, to study that issue, the fact of institutions that have come to us and said that Bill 4 is having an implication for them.

The report says: "Bill 4 will also have serious implications for a number of financial institutions that have substantial loan portfolios in the rental housing sector. These institutions will be affected in several ways." I am going to list some of them just to show that I think this time allocation motion should be defeated to enable us to spend time and elaborate more on those subjects.

The first item that is referred to: Those institutions that "have made loans for the purchase of rental apartments will now find the value against which they loaned drastically reduced." They give the example of a purchase price of \$1 million. "A trust company might have required 25% equity from the purchaser and loaned the remaining \$750,000, leaving itself what would normally be a sufficient cushion against the drop in the real estate market."

We have had individuals come to us, not sufficient numbers but some who have come to us and have said that Bill 4 will have an effect on the value of buildings in this province. The report states: "government action alone has cut 30% off the value of the asset, as well as locking the owner into an ongoing loss situation. If he cannot carry this monthly loss, for which he never budgeted since he had a government order entitling him to rent increases to bring him to break even"—and that is a fact, where government orders were given to allow people to carry on with their financing—"he may well forfeit the property. The financial institution will be left with an asset worth less than the loans they provided against it, and the tenants will be stuck with an absentee landlord whose interest and expertise is not in the operation of buildings."

We have a landlord who has been put out of business and we have an institution that really does not care, that does not have the expertise to manage these buildings. That whole subject needs to be canvassed, and yet this time allocation resolution, if passed, precludes us from debating that further.

The second effect on institutions that needs to be canvassed further in this House, and which we will not be allowed to do if this resolution carries, is that "these financial institutions have provided funds for landlords to undertake capital improvements," and clearly facts have been provided to do that. This is based on the provision in the law for receiving increased rents to repay these loans. That is what the existing law states.

If that law, Bill 4, passes and retroactively changes the rules, "landlords who do not have other lines of business to subsidize this work may go bankrupt," and that is a whole subject, the issue of bankruptcy, that this House needs to spend some time on. The committee did not spend any time on the subject of bankruptcy and this House has not spent any time on the subject of bankruptcy, and if this resolution carries, then that item will go untalked about. It will just be ignored. It will be referred to, because we have had people come and say they are going bankrupt because of Bill 4.

There are hundreds of millions of dollars involved in this matter. "While these might be a pittance if it were spread widely among all the banks, trust companies and credit unions, the fact is that a small number of firms specialized in this field." A small number of financial institutions clearly specialized in this field. "Some of them have already had to write down large portfolios related to other real estate sectors, and the wholesale changes initiated by Bill 4 may push them towards more serious problems."

It will be the "depositors and the taxpayers who ultimately pay the costs" if you follow this line of reasoning all the way through and the effects that Bill 4 has on the people who loan the money; finally the taxpayers and finally we the people. But we have not had a chance to discuss that. We have not had a chance to debate that, because there may be various alternatives that can come to light as we are debating it.

Even the introduction of amendments is being precluded by this resolution. After a specific time, according to the wording of the resolution, no further amendments will be allowed. We will only be allowed to debate those specific resolutions. It is another example of how this government is trying to ram this legislation through. They simply do not care.

It is like when we first agreed in committee. We agreed to have five weeks to discuss Bill 4, and ultimately that withered away to three weeks. We ended up with three weeks and the same process is continuing. We now have a resolution that is going to stop debate, and that is what happened at committee and that is what is happening now.

On those and other items, we certainly need to spend some time. Certainly there are other topics. There is the whole subject of objectives that I believe this government needs to study, and that has not been done. I believe this government would need to look at a number of objectives

with respect to common interests with all the landlords and all the tenants, as opposed to simply picking the tenants or one particular group. I think we need to look at the effect on everyone—the landlords, the tenants, the investors, the workers, the people who are losing their jobs, everyone—and that is not being done.

1540

In light of that, I believe that we should have an opportunity to present comments made by individuals who have not been heard, and even some to emphasize some of those who have during the hearing debates. We are not being allowed to do that as a result of the time allocation motion.

We received submissions by a Phil Sweetnam, who is from the Ottawa-Carleton area. He suggested five objectives of common interest to the landlords and tenants in the rental housing market. Those five objectives, I believe, need to be canvassed by this House, which may lead to amendments, and we will not be allowed to do that.

The first one—I am referring to Mr Sweetnam—which was filed on 15 February, is "to strive towards the most cost-effective use of the taxpayers' money." The second is "to keep Ontario's aging rental housing stock in good and usable condition." The third is "to provide an adequate supply of rental housing at all price levels." Fourth, "to provide realistic access to clean and safe rental housing to those in financial need." Fifth, "to find solutions to the housing needs and challenges that face us in a spirit of 'renting partnership' between landlords and tenants."

Clearly, some of these arguments, I would hope, will be dealt with by the permanent legislation, but they also need to be dealt with in the interim legislation, and we are not being allowed a chance to do that as a result of this resolution.

Mr Sweetnam commented as to the first objective, and that has to do with cost-effective provision of housing, "The first goal is to strive towards the most cost-effective use of the taxpayers' money to provide housing for the people in Ontario." Mr Sweetnam says that "since the 100,000 landlords, who now provide 85% of the rental housing, cost the taxpayer nothing, it would be cost-effective to have Bill 4 brought forward as legislation in a form that respected the rights of tenants but still permitted the housing industry to attract sufficient capital to meet most of the housing needs for Ontarians."

That is an excellent point and it has never been raised. It has never been raised once in the committee or in this House, and yet we will not be able to canvass it further. We will not be able to explore that further in this House because of this resolution.

Mr Sweetnam said that "the cost of Ontario's 144,000 rent-geared-to-income units has led to a substantial escalation of the Ministry of Housing budget." That is something we need to look at. He went back and referred to his statistics of 1985-86. The total budget of the Ministry of Housing in that period of time was \$243 million. That increased in 1989-90 to \$537 million; in 1990-91 to \$647 million. Therefore, Mr Sweetnam points out, across the province the budget has increased 266% in six years, or compounded annually, 22%.

Is that where we want to go? Do we want the taxpayers of this province to be funding that proposal? I think we need to study that, because private enterprise certainly should be a partner in this area and it is being discouraged by this government. We need to debate that and the time allocation resolution of two days prevents us from adequately getting into that.

Then Mr Sweetnam gets into local statistics of subsidized rents, and that can be referred to another time hopefully, if the resolution is withdrawn. We could get into that and study that further. He says, "From the above information it is obvious that whatever can be done to encourage the private sector to provide rental housing is prudent financial management of your provincial resources." This government cannot do it on its own; it needs private enterprise. The taxpayers cannot do it alone; they need help. This government says it does not need that help.

Mr Sweetnam states:

"When I wear the hat of the chairman of the Mississippi Valley Conservation Authority I observe that projects in which the province can participate have always been limited by the availability of funding. In contrast to the Ministry of Housing budget, which has been increased annually at 22%, the budget of the 39 conservation authorities has not increased in the past seven years." That is a fact that needs to be studied further.

"In fact, the \$45-million annual cost of rent review administration is only a little below the province's \$50-million total funding of all the conservation authorities of Ontario." Now that is a startling fact and we need to study that. We need to see what is wrong with the system, but this government obviously does not want to hear of that; it does not want to listen to those facts at all.

Mr Sweetnam talks about how: "Excellent projects have to be phased in over many years to receive the provincial contribution. It is obvious that public funds are required in many institutions such as schools, hospitals, environmental projects and these needs cannot be met by the private sector."

His second objective that he has referred to and very briefly refers to, which I think this House has not spent adequate time on and will not if this resolution is carried, is keeping Ontario's aging rental housing stock in good condition. Mr Sweetnam says:

"Our experience, as the owner of a 65-unit mobile home park for 22 years, is that the return of investment is about 4% per annum, similar to the provincial average of 3.5% (1989 Ministry of Housing study)."

Mr Sweetnam states:

"During those 22 years we have always accepted the ministry inflationary guidelines for rent increases. We have held to this guideline even in the years that we installed municipal water or have had extensive septic tank repairs. I'm sure you would agree that this entitles us to the reputation of responsible and co-operative landlords.

"With 165 people in 65 units on 7.5 acres, the time has come when municipal sewers must be installed."

Of course, we did spend some time with respect to mobile home parks and, hopefully, as a result of that, the

government will have a chance to reflect on the comments that were made and withdraw that section from the bill.

Mr Sweetnam states:

"During August I took out the permit from the township of Goulbourn. With the cancellation of rent increases for capital expenditures and the high cost of sewer installation, we have cancelled this project."

That is what we hear time and time again: As the result of Bill 4 projects are being cancelled. If that is not getting through to the members of this government, then we need to spend more time with them. We need to spend more time and hopefully they will change their minds and reflect on some of the things that we have been saying. But this government wants to ram through the legislation with respect to this resolution.

Mr Sweetnam states:

"The major detriment to the industry is caused by the retroactive deletion of awarded rent increases. Although I have been able to stop my project and escape the problem of retroactivity, the change in rules has undermined my confidence in government consistency. I do not believe it is beneficial to delete the capital improvements cost pass-through provision. This direction from the Ministry of Housing in Bill 4 seems more of a response to the rhetoric of 'gouging landlords' than to the reality of the marketplace."

That subject, to date, has been relatively silent in this committee and will remain silent when this resolution is passed.

Mr Sweetnam states:

"According to the Ministry of Housing's own statistics, only 154 apartments out of a total of 1.2 million in Ontario experienced increases over 100% in the 22 months ending October 1990. The same sources indicate that 74% of the total rental properties experienced increases at or below the guideline level of 4.6%."

That is another subject that we are not being able to discuss. We are not being able to get into that at all.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. If you want to hold a conversation you can do it outside the House, but not inside the House. The member for Dufferin-Peel, please.

1550

Mr Tilson: The third objective that Mr Sweetnam refers to, which I believe this House needs to spend some time on, is the subject of supply, and not only supply but adequate supply of rental housing at all prices. Clearly by the very fact that the Minister of Housing keeps announcing that he is going to be putting so many units into the system when no other units are coming from other sources, he is acknowledging that we have a problem. We need to debate with him and question him more on that problem, but this resolution precludes us from doing that.

Mr Sweetnam refers to the Ottawa Citizen report of December 1990. That report is enclosed, and if time permitted, we would deal with that report, but we are not going to be able to deal with that report. From that report Mr Sweetnam sees that the vacancy rate in October for Ottawa-Carleton was at 0.5% for town houses and apartments, in

contrast to Hull across the river where rent review provisions permit agreement between landlord and tenants about the amount of rent. There is agreement between tenants and landlords across the river with respect to rent. In Hull rents are lower and the vacancy rate is at 4.2%. That is an alarming fact and needs to be discussed by this House, but we are not going to be able to discuss it.

The report from the Ottawa Citizen that is referred to illustrates that 75% of the new rental units built since 1982 are condominiums. They were sold as tax shelters to investors who rented them to tenants. Upon the termination of condominiums as tax shelters, this supply of new rental units has dried up. In other sections of his presentation Mr Sweetnam talks about keeping a moderate return for investors so that they will continue to provide these units as rental accommodation. Why in the world would people get into the housing market with legislation such as this? They cannot make a dollar at it; they cannot make a dime at it.

How in the world are we going to encourage people to get into the real estate market to build new housing accommodation, to buy new housing accommodation and improve what is already there? How are we going to do that? We are not allowed, as a result of this resolution, to discuss that. For the life of me, there has been no sign from this government as to how it is going to encourage the private sector to do that.

Mr Sweetnam continues with respect to the mobile home community—I believe he refers to it as Fringe-wood—which was developed under a plan of subdivision. They were able, therefore, to sell the lots.

“As the original leases became shorter, we have had many requests for extensions to the lease to permit longer amortization of mortgages on the homes. This housing stock has been a significant portion of the low-cost housing units in the Stittsville area. Condominium owners, who have the option to sell, have been withdrawing from the market due to the lack of consistence and reliable policies from government.”

That is the problem. The people in this province have lost faith in the province of Ontario as a result of Bill 4. We have had person after person come to us and state that, yet we cannot deal with that in our debate in this House because of this resolution, if it carries.

Mr Sweetnam states:

“This further reduces the supply of rental units and affordable housing to the region. Likewise, we have decided to sell the sites as the leases shorten. Since 1983, we have reduced our supply of rental lots from 130 to 95.

“It is difficult to make a financial commitment to provide market value accommodation when the expectation is that the subsidized rent is the market rent.”

That is a factor that has never been discussed, the policies of the government and the effect that they are going to have on the private sector. That is another fact that has never been discussed in the committee hearings, and I hope that we would have an opportunity to discuss it in this committee.

“Without the supply of rental accommodation by the private sector, the queue for public housing gets longer, while a select few get the housing. In Stittsville, it took

about 1.5 years to fill the Poole Creek Apartments, which had approximately 60 units at approximately 1.65 times the rental in the subsidized seniors' apartments.”

The fourth item that Mr Sweetnam refers to on which some time should be spent, I would submit, by this committee, which the resolution precludes us from doing, is the subject of access to housing for the financially disadvantaged. I have referred to that somewhat, but Mr Sweetnam speaks of the fact, and I agree with him, that, “Landlords and tenants would agree that those in financial need should have reasonable and realistic access to clean, safe housing.” This was a comment that was made constantly by all members of the NDP representatives, and I would agree with them.

“While on the surface it may be that Bill 4 will reduce rental increases to the poor, the reality is that the vast majority of any rent savings produced by Ontario's rent control system is enjoyed not by the poor but by the middle- and upper-income tenants. CMHC tells us that the average Ontario renter spends only 18% of gross income on shelter costs, including utilities and parking in most cases.”

Mr Sweetnam speaks of that, and it is a subject that needs to be discussed. He states:

“The best way to help the 28% of renters who pay more than the 30% of their income for shelter is to provide them with income in the form of social assistance and better training opportunities so that they may rent their own apartments. This would not only cost less but would give these people a wider range of accommodation.”

We had many, many delegations come to us at the committee hearings which spoke to us of how they were having great financial difficulties as a result of rents, and they indicated clearly all rents. There was a group in Ottawa that was quite clear. They had a serious problem paying any rents. Certainly they have trouble with the statutory amounts that are being suggested by Bill 4. Yet this bill does not assist those people, and there do not appear to be any other bills that are coming forward from any other ministry to deal with it. I think we need to debate that in this committee, and this resolution precludes us from doing that.

The final item that Mr Sweetnam refers to, which clearly has been raised by other delegations to our committee and which I believe time should be spent on, is a subject with respect to the partnership that is needed between the landlord and the tenant, because this bill and its effects have created an animosity never seen before in the housing industry in this province between the landlord and the tenant.

Mr Sweetnam states

“The rent control system in Ontario has promoted an adversarial relationship between landlords and tenants rather than a spirit of co-operation. There is a suspicion that any rent above the guideline is reprehensible even when justifiable costs have been incurred.

“The best way to provide subsidized housing is to disperse it through various communities rather than providing subsidized housing ghettos. If tenants have the income, then they can select a convenient community in which to

live. Most landlords would commit between 5% and 10% of the units to subsidize tenants."

Now this may or may not be a good solution that is being offered by Mr Sweetnam. I think we would need to canvass that further and need to discuss it further, but we are not going to be able to do that. I think it is imperative that it be done in the moratorium period rather than wait for the permanent legislation. I would hope it is going to be dealt with in the permanent legislation, but clearly it needs to be dealt with now. This resolution precludes us from doing that.

Mr Sweetnam says, "These suggestions would encourage the continued participation of the private sector in housing the people of Ontario," but I think we need to look at that, and the resolution does, as I say, stop us from further debate on that subject.

With respect to other problems that this bill has caused, examples have been given by some delegations to us at the committee. I have also been making some submissions here and I think we need to talk about it more.

1600

For example, this submission I do not believe was filed as an exhibit, but it was given to, presumably, some members of the House, and it was an article by Ted Stella on the topic "Residential Rent Review in Ontario." He raised a number of questions which I do not think the committee adequately got into in its deliberations over amendments, and clearly this House is not going to be able to do it as well as a result of that resolution. He talked about, "What has this legislation achieved, other than to provide employment to a new set of bureaucrats and to reallocate our collective tax moneys to a cumbersome and unwieldy bureaucracy." In other words, he is asking the question, "What is the legislation doing?" This is what he said:

"In my scorebook it has:

"1. Resulted in automatic minimum increases instead of allowing market forces and competition to establish proper price levels;

"2. Brought the creation of residential rental housing (except subsidized units) to an abrupt halt (governments have been trying to coax the industry back to this field with various schemes and incentives but without any appreciable success);"

Of course with this bill it has stopped. It has come to a dead stop, and we need to debate that, but the time allocation resolution precludes it.

"3. Contributed to the slow decline in the quality as well as quantity of the existing rental housing stock;

"4. Forced former major creators of good housing stock into other, less irksome investment opportunities and some, in fact, have just left the country for that purpose."

That will take years to correct. Hopefully, if this bill were withdrawn, no further investors would leave and we would have an opportunity to address that subject.

Mr Stella states, "Just count how many former residential builders have quietly stopped building rental apartment units and have shifted the emphasis to commercial development."

I challenge the government to produce facts as to the residential development in private enterprise—I am not

speaking of the government-inspired development but the private enterprise system—that are now in process and have been in progress since this government took office.

"5. Singled out one specific business group—namely, those who have chosen to invest in residential rental units—to unreasonably and unfairly subsidize tenants, who are not in need of subsidies in the first place, by making it a price-controlled industry."

I referred to that yesterday. I referred to the fact that there are very wealthy tenants in this province, that there are middle-class earning people in this province, and it has affected those people as well. It is legislation that has benefited the rich, but meanwhile, and I emphasize that, the whole subject of the poor who cannot afford any increase has not been dealt with, and we need time to deal with that subject, but this resolution precludes us from doing that.

"6. Subsidized tenants to the point where they have absolutely no incentive to own. Any simple calculation shows clearly that they can rent for a fraction of the cost which would apply if they owned comparable premises under standard terms of purchase."

Finally, Mr Stella states, it has, "Forced various levels of government to either enter or expand their direct involvement in the housing business—again adding to the cost borne by the taxpayer." He concludes these items by stating, "Most of us will agree that governments are not the most astute or economic producers of housing." I of course challenge the government on that fact.

There have been other reports that have been given to us which I believe we need time to elaborate on and to spend time on in this House, and this resolution of course says that we cannot do that.

There was a presentation given to us in northern Ontario. It was given to us in Sudbury, and it was a man by the name of Ken Kaltiainen, who is a senior architectural draftsman with a local architectural firm in Sudbury. He made comments, not as a landlord, not as a tenant, but as another party. We need to study those types of comments that were made by Ken Kaltiainen. We need to study more positions taken by this as to the effect that this legislation is having on the economy, because clearly, if this resolution carries, the time allocation carries, we will not be able to do that.

Mr Kaltiainen came to us and talked from his perspective as to the effects of Bill 4 on him and specifically on the consulting technical industry. He made it quite clear that he did not represent the architectural industry, that he did not represent any legal association. He said that he graduated in 1975 from Algonquin College in Pembroke as an architectural technologist and then returned to Sudbury to look for a job in his field.

He could not find a job in Sudbury, for two reasons stated by the local architects: First, he had no experience in doing concrete or steel buildings, which left only one other option, and that was to do wood frame construction, which is basically single- and multiple-family housing. Then he states that the next reason he was unemployable in Sudbury was that no housing was being built at this time. The reason stated was that the developers were not building multiple-family housing property due to the temporary

freeze put on multiple-family housing by the then government on multiple units.

At that time in Sudbury there was a vacancy rate of 10%, and also in Sudbury, which he claims was in financial ruins due to a mining strike that had crippled the Sudbury economy, it did not have any help from either the federal or provincial governments. To make matters worse, the mining industry laid off a number of individuals from the mining staff. Over the next 14 or 15 years, Sudbury had a negative population growth, so therefore there was no need for housing, for his services, at that time. He had to go to Edmonton, and he did go to Edmonton, to gain experience in his field because of that economic situation. He had to leave his home and a province where he was born and he says that he travelled 2,500 miles to get something that he could not get in the largest, most powerful province in Canada, Ontario.

I ask the question: What has happened to Ontario? What has happened since this government has taken office? Why are people saying these things about the province?

He states that once out there, he had to make a decision as to what types of construction experience would enable him to return to his home town to find employment. The three areas that he concentrated on were the housing industry, the commercial industry, which covers retail and office buildings, as well as educational types of buildings, such as high schools, colleges and universities. As proven by his return, it was the best type of experience and it did increase his chances of obtaining employment with a northern Ontario architect.

With this he returned back to Sudbury and he realized that all construction was in the private sector. He states that there was very little construction in the multiple-family sector, which was non-existent; there were no new schools, colleges or universities being built; the renovation jobs in the education industry are few and far between, and once he realized what was happening, he sat back and evaluated why there was no housing being built in Ontario. The bottom line, according to him, was that if no housing was being built, one third of his technical capabilities was literally wiped out. He realized that the commercial and education sectors would not last very long.

"Today there is very little commercial work produced in northern Ontario for the simple reason that in Sudbury alone we have a 5% retail vacancy rate."

He then mentions the three areas of construction involvement relating to architects' offices: First is the boom time, being office and retail construction. The next phase would be the slowdown or cool-down. Residential construction would enter at this stage for the simple reason that most contractors are now out of work and their prices are far more aggressive. The last phase he calls the economic bust.

"This sector, which is the only sector remaining for draughtsmen such as myself, is projects funded by government at all levels."

1610

The Deputy Speaker: I would just like to remind you of what I said yesterday, that you have to stay on topic.

Mr Tilson: The reason why of course we are proceeding with this type of thing is to show an example that needs to be canvassed further by this House, and this resolution of course precludes us from doing that and that is why I am giving this as an example as to why we need to spend more time on this subject, because this individual cannot find any work. He is highly qualified. He submits it is because of Bill 4. I am getting to see that.

He asks that very question. He asks how Bill 4 affects him and he states that: "If no new commercial or educational facilities are being built, that leaves only the multiple-family sector. With Bill 4, who in the private sector would take their money and invest in a multiple-family dwelling with all the headaches, as well as an average 3% return on their investment?"

Would they do that? he asks. "Most clients we know would much rather take the capital that they have and secure it in a financial institution with a guarantee of at least a 10% return on their money, not to mention the headaches they will not go through." Clearly, with this legislation, they are going to have lots of headaches, so why would they get into it?

He states that from monitoring the proceedings in other cities with the legislative committee—and I believe that people in this industry did who had no connection to the landlords and no connection to the tenants but were in between, were people looking for jobs—he felt that he had quite an independent view on the situation.

He talked about the present scenario in Ontario, and he asked the question which I believe we need to ask this government in this committee, and of course the resolution precludes us from doing that. He asks the question, "How are we going to build investor confidence?" How are we going to do that? "It makes it so difficult to produce effective, affordable housing for all sectors and financial groups."

He states that building multiple-family units, he can count 38 trades, not to mention unions, financially related personnel and building material suppliers that will be without jobs, including himself. He states, "With Bill 4 and the rent controls, not only will I be unemployed, but I will stand beside thousands and very well hundreds of thousands of jobs that are constantly being lost every day."

He emphasizes the fact, and we need to emphasize the fact in this House, that: "From public figures available, there is a shortage of 110,000 units in Ontario. If the average draftsman can produce a 20-unit in one month, this relates to 458 years of employment for architectural draughtsmen alone, not including subsequent draughtsmen...engineers, financial people."

This is a whole slew of other people we have not discussed. We have talked about the carpenters and the electrical engineers, but this is a whole slew of other people who the committee and certainly this House have not had an adequate time to discuss and debate and to submit resolutions, but the time allocation resolution precludes us from doing that.

He states, "If government was to build the 110,000 units, at approximately \$78,000 a unit," and that of course is what it costs in Sudbury—which is a whole other subject of debate

that we have around the province, which I think we need to challenge the government on, the cost of building government-sponsored units as opposed to private enterprise units and who can do it more efficiently. That is something that we have never really got into and which we need to get into, and this resolution precludes us from doing that, but he states that if you took a unit at approximately \$78,000 a unit in the Sudbury area, this would put a tax burden on the people of Ontario at approximately \$8.5 billion.

His first question is an obvious question, but it is a question we need to deal with. We need to deal with it in this House and we are not going to be able to deal with it as a result of this resolution. His first question is, "Who is going to pay for the \$8.5-billion burden?" From the feedback that he has received in his area—and I can assure members in all areas—he states, "We are overtaxed and overburdened from this situation."

He states that it is his experience that:

"It would be far more economical to have the private sector build a majority of these units, as private people have proven that they can build the same unit for 30% to 35% cheaper, and in the private sector the burden of financing these units would not be transferred to the taxpayers who no longer have additional funds at this time."

Those are two issues we need to debate in this House. We asked the Minister of Housing when he was in Windsor about this whole subject of whether cheaper housing could be provided by non-profit or private enterprise. He challenged the speaker, a delegation who was there, "Well, you produce the facts to us." It is up to the government to produce the facts. If that information is wrong, then they should provide it.

More important is the second statement this individual made. He stated, "The burden of financing these units would not be transferred to the taxpayer." We have tax problems in this province. We should be trying with every bill to alleviate the tax problems that are going on throughout this country.

We hear of tax revolts all across this country, and this is another example where taxes could be saved by allowing the private investor to get into the housing market, which would result in the government's not getting into the housing industry and making it a public utility, as has been suggested by this government.

He goes on to state:

"When Premier Rae visited Wall Street in order to reassure the international investor that Ontario was still a good place to invest, I do not recall Premier Rae mentioning to these investors in New York that they could invest anywhere that they like but not in the housing industry."

That is why we need to fight this bill, but we are not being allowed to fight the bill. We are not being allowed to fight the bill adequately by simply providing us with two days and limiting us to the number of resolutions or amendments we can put forward in debate.

That is what he is speaking about. We need to fight this bill. Hopefully we can do it in a persuasive fashion, producing facts and reasoned arguments that would persuade the government to change its mind on some of the positions it

has taken. I am sure they want to solve the housing industry in this province. I believe them when they say they do. That is one of the few things I do believe them in, but I think we need more time to help persuade them on their position.

He talks about another item that hits home for him, "that northern Ontario is not like southern Ontario." In other words, Bill 4 applies willy-nilly across the whole province. It is a valid point and we did discuss it at some length in places like London and I believe Windsor, but that subject needs to be canvassed further. That subject needs to be canvassed in this committee and we are not being allowed to do that because of this time allocation resolution.

He talks of northern Ontario as being a very friendly and a very helping, caring community. He says:

"We don't have the social and crime problems to the extent of southern Ontario, even though we are not as large. Yes, we have our share of bad landlords and we have our share of bad tenants, but what I can't understand is why northern Ontario is paying for some of the problems that southern Ontario has."

The other thing that evades him is "why perhaps 10% of the people truly affected by the situation are punishing the other 90%." Why is that happening? He states that from his investigation, "Sudbury could use in excess of 1,000 housing units and, according to CMHC's reports, in the next few years that 1,000 units will become 5,000 units."

He does not see, and I agree with him, how "with the present legislation, let alone the government building co-operative housing units, we will ever resolve the housing crisis," in northern Ontario, and I go further, in this province. We need time to debate that. We need time in this House to debate that and this resolution, if it passes, will not give us that time. That is a very serious subject.

How are we going to do that? How will Bill 4 ever resolve the housing crisis in the province? I suppose the minister will say, "It is not intended to resolve it; it is interim legislation." But we cannot let some of the effects of it sit for two years. We have to deal with them. Either that or the minister should bring in the permanent bill and withdraw Bill 4.

He goes on to say, "It is known fact that 80% of the housing stock in Ontario is over 25 years old and with this present legislation the property owners will have no legal way of paying for the fire code and building code upgrades required," which also form part of the field that he is working in. Here is an expert who is talking about regulations from this province and from municipalities that landlords need to deal with, and they need to deal with them now. They cannot wait for two years for this legislation to expire. They need to deal with it now and we need to debate it now. We cannot allow this legislation to carry on and create the problems that will result if fire code and building code upgrades are not met by the landlords of this province.

1620

Existing buildings, he states, "over the next years become firetraps, the buildings become unsafe, you are also

eliminating the capabilities of maintaining safe dwellings for people to live in." The subject of safety has been dealt with in this respect. We had a presentation by the Concrete Restoration Association, but we are not able to discuss it in this House because of this dreaded resolution and we need to discuss it. We need to prevent unsafe dwellings from being created by this bill and we need time to debate that, but we are not going to be able to debate that.

I am going to stop trying to pronounce his name, but one more time Ken Kaltiainen has added experience which I have found very useful. I think this committee would like to hear this and other comments such as this from other provinces, experiences we have heard in other provinces, because the province of Ontario, this government certainly, has not provided that information. There has been some information brought forward to us by various groups. There was even a presentation that was held in this building, which I referred to yesterday and which only the parliamentary assistant attended. The Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party were represented, but the government was not.

In other words, we need to compare this whole subject that Bill 4 is getting us into. We need to compare that to the other provinces; we need to compare that to other jurisdictions in other countries. I submit that given the opportunity in this debate, if this time allocation motion were defeated, we would be able to do that and hopefully that would have a persuasive effect on this government to change its mind on either the entire bill or major portions of it.

He refers to the fact that while in Alberta he monitored the rental housing markets as that was part of his daily living.

"There were no rent controls and there were always vacancies. Out there, I had a choice at any given time, whether it be in the boom or the bust as to where I can rent, what I want to pay for rent, what kind of rent and amenities I want to pay for at any given time. The market was basically controlling itself. If I didn't want to pay for amenities or an apartment that I felt was not part of my needs, part of my financial structure, I had the choice by not renting that apartment and the landlord knew that I wasn't going to rent his apartment for those particular reasons."

"Now back in Ontario tenants do not have the choice as to where they can rent and how much they're going to pay for rent and where and what and how they want to pay for it. Here the only thing that tenants know is that when an apartment comes up for rent, there may be 100 people or more chasing that same apartment. Also, the tenants know that in good times or bad their rents are always going to go up."

Even with this legislation the rents are always going up. The poor people of this province are not going to be able to pay those rents, and we need to discuss that. We need to compare what is going on in other provinces and in other countries with what is going on in Ontario. We need experts. We need expert reports to be given to us, but that has never occurred, and with the time limitation that was put forward by the NDP members of the committee, we were precluded from bringing further witnesses to do that.

Therefore, this is the last hope. This is the last hope we have, for members of the opposition and members of the government, to provide this information to this House to hopefully persuade the government to change its mind.

He said since 1983 all three government parties have proven that the existing Band-Aid legislation does not work and never will, and I think all three parties, including this party, have to accept that responsibility. But this bill makes things worse. This bill goes even further than either the Liberal or the Conservative governments even dreamt of going. The private sector has been telling the government that rent controls do not work. The private sector reports have been telling officials that rent controls do not work, and nobody seems to be listening. Our housing problem is going in one direction and it is only going to get worse.

People in the north who buy and build rental property are doing it basically for one reason, and that is to secure a future pension income. There are those who do it for other reasons but they are few and far between. These northern Ontario pension seekers, known as landlords, are a minority, and their industry is being choked to the point that they are being forced into bankruptcy.

Have you noticed how this word keeps popping up, Madam Speaker, the word "bankruptcy"? It keeps cropping up time after time after time, yet we do not have a chance to debate that. This time resolution says that we are given two days. But we are not going to be able to get into the whole subject of bankruptcy and the effect it has on the people of this province and the industry of this province and the economy of this province.

He states: "By taking away this portion of the industry, you are also sending me into bankruptcy." He is going to go bankrupt. He says, with his workload diminishing, "my value to an architectural firm becomes less and less important, and the work that I love to do so well throughout my career is slowly being diminished." He asks, "Therefore, what is the resolution to solve all these problems?" We need to talk about that, but we are not being able to talk about that because of this time allocation resolution.

He states:

"On the one hand, we have tenants who claim that they are being nickel-and-dimed to death, with no repairs or maintenance being performed to their buildings, and they can't afford to live anywhere but in the apartment that they have, if they have one at all."

That is a fact. There is no question that there are tenants from all walks of life who are talking about how their rents are going up and their quality of life is deteriorating. The quality of their buildings is deteriorating because money is not being put into them. That is a fact and we need to study that fact and the causes of it. Will Bill 4 solve that problem?

"On the other hand we have the building investor"—or the landlord—"who makes a 3% profit, is limited in funds available for improving his or her building or building new ones, and then to the far right we have the government"—he is saying "to the far right"; I am sure he meant the far left. However, he says, "To the far right we have the government trying to please all parties and offending everyone." I am

sure it is a typographical error. I am sure he meant to the far left.

He concludes by saying that in his opinion, the first thing that must be done is "through the government and their co-operative housing programs, shelter those who really need it." Now do we need to help people over here? There are people in this government who are in co-operatives. I am not saying to do away with co-operatives, but let's take a look at that. Let's take a look at the cost of housing this government is getting the taxpayer of this province into.

Second, "Eliminate the geared-to-income for those who do not need it. People who earn in excess of \$35,000 to \$45,000 do not need subsidized housing." That fact is debatable as well. I am not saying I agree with these recommendations or these thoughts he has, but I am saying they raise questions. It raises questions we need to debate in this House and we need to debate at this committee level, and this time allocation resolution precludes us from debating these issues.

Third, "The next option we may have is to offer developers an incentive to create new housing. It is a proven fact that developers may build the same structure for 30% cheaper than the government housing." We have to deal with that. I am sure that in the budget that is going to be coming down we are going to be hearing of all kinds of money being poured into the non-profit housing sector, even though we have facts that have come from these hearings that have said that private enterprise can do it for 30% more cheaply. We have not had an opportunity to deal with that and we will not have an opportunity, because clearly, with this time allocation resolution, there will be no new resolutions allowed.

Fourthly, "Bill 4, with all its tenant supportiveness and all its landlord objections should be eliminated completely." That of course has been our position from the outset; not this party's, of course. The Liberal Party voted in favour of it at the second reading but we voted against it. We have been consistent, and we believe it is bad for the people of Ontario. We believe it is bad for the tenants, bad for the landlords, bad for the unemployed, bad for the investors. It is bad for everyone. It is bad for the economy and we want to spend some more time on how bad it is.

1630

Fifth, "The government should provide shelter allowances to the tenants and not be in the construction business. Tenants should have accessibility to a shelter allowance so that the \$1.4 billion spent annually by the Ontario government is better distributed to those who really need it."

Sixth, "The government should work with the private sector to create new housing with the government allowing the private sector a fair return on their investment."

These are just a few that this individual suggests and I am sure that if further time were allowed, with the time allocation motion defeated, we would have an opportunity to get into other areas and perhaps improve this bill further.

The last item he speaks about is that "this is a perfect opportunity for the elected NDP government to create housing, also create jobs and perhaps, with this creation of

new housing, new jobs, this may very well turn the economic times of this province in a positive direction."

Those are our words. Those are the words we have said from the very dastardly day on 28 November. That is what we want to do. We want to improve jobs. We want to improve housing. This bill goes the other way. But we are not going to have a chance to do that. We are going to be cut off. It is going to be rammed down our throats, with no further time to debate this.

He states: "If this government is unsure of these particular suggestions or any other suggestions offered during the time of this committee's investigation, why not use northern Ontario as a test area and monitor the results? It would not be difficult to set up an organization involving landlords, tenants, government and any other party affected in this housing crisis to monitor the tested area."

I am not saying I support that, but at least it is an area that we could canvass in this House, that we could discuss to determine whether or not it is possible for such a proposal to come forward. It may not work, but I know one thing. Bill 4 is not going to work, and we need more time to persuade this government that this cannot take place.

We had all walks of life at our hearings. Clearly there were over 100 delegations that asked to be heard at the committee and went unheard, even though, I believe, if the additional two weeks were allowed to be spent on Bill 4 as was originally agreed upon, we would have had time to hear those delegations. Certainly that was denied by this government. I think, as I have stated, that that is the continuous thread, the common thread that goes out through this entire proceeding, culminating in this resolution to end debate on perhaps the most serious economic venture this government has got into.

There was a small group of people. This is just typical of one. It is very brief and I will summarize what they have stated. These are the types of groups that I believe we should talk about in this House.

There is no question that if resolutions and amendments are put forward by any member in this House—the amendments that have been filed by the member for Eglinton and by me on behalf of my party are the only amendments, and I think there were two more amendments that were filed by the member for Carleton. If this resolution is carried, there will be no further amendments allowed, not even to be introduced. That is unfair and that is what the whole process is all about. The whole process is unfair. I therefore hope that members of the government would stop the unfairness they have been dealing with throughout this legislation debate and specifically on this specific resolution.

This is a group from Toronto that calls itself Nu-West Businesses and Properties. They filed a submission to us that talks about the effects of this bill on them and the effects on their financial loss. I think that this and others should be emphasized to other members of the House who perhaps did not have an opportunity to hear them at the committee level, because this gets at the real root of the problem, the financial loss, the unfairness of Bill 4.

The specific report is filed by a Gurnam Kundhal, who is the chairman of this group. They are a group who call

themselves 15 ordinary Canadians who came to Canada about 20 years ago. They state that they all work ordinary jobs. They have average yearly incomes of approximately \$35,000. Throughout these years they have tried to save every penny they could so that they could afford some financial security in their old age and also provide for their children's education. This group of 15 people, 15 ordinary Canadians, ordinary people from Ontario, put all of their savings together to form a partnership. It is an incorporated numbered company and the name of the company is Nu-West Businesses and Properties.

The purpose of this company was to invest their savings for growth and return. They had the right to do that. That is what people have been doing in the housing industry, and we seem to be veering away from that whole concept with this specific legislation. That seems to be the one that is being set by this government. I think we should spend some time in debate in this committee on that subject. Because of the time allocation motion, we will not be able to do that. This whole veering-away of philosophy needs to be debated further because the whole system is being changed and we submit it is being changed for the worse.

They state: "We looked at many options such as buying a business, a commercial property, or a residential apartment building in Ontario, or in other provinces of Canada or in the United States. After a lot of thought and research we decided to invest in residential real estate in Ontario as the Ontario laws encouraged investments in apartment buildings by allowing landlords a fair return on their investments and by allowing for fair rent increases to cover financial losses and capital expenditures."

Not any more. Not any more is that going to happen as a result of this legislation. That is the end. People are not going to invest in this province because of this dastardly bill. We have the right to come to this House and debate it, but we are not being given that right because of this resolution.

Mr Kundhal states: "We employed services of competent real estate brokers and started investing in residential real estate in Toronto area in 1986. Our investment strategy and planning was based on the existing laws of Ontario as per the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986." They came to Ontario, they looked at the existing laws, they trusted this province, and that is where they invested their money. And this is what this government is going to do to them.

They talk about their holdings. These are not, the big gouging landlords the Minister of Housing has talked about. These are average people, and we have the right to assist those people by debating, in this House, this whole problem. This time allocation resolution says, "No, we are going to ram it through and we won't allow you to debate that any further."

They go on to state: "We purchased four small apartment buildings (totalling 225 residential units), one in 1988, two in 1989 and one in early 1990. The total purchase price of these buildings was approximately \$13.8 million with existing mortgages approximately \$11.4 million. The financial loss on these buildings as calculated per the rent review regulations is as shown," and they attach a

schedule. "In addition we have a loan of approximately \$600,000 (which was acquired over the last few years to finance the yearly cash flow shortages due to the financial loss)."

The members can see the development of this, and there are more stories that I think should be brought to this committee. This resolution says, "No, let's not talk about it any more." I do not blame the government for not talking about it any more because it is embarrassing. The fact that they have introduced this bill is embarrassing.

Nu-West states: "For two of our buildings we have rent review orders given as phase-ins"—and they show attachments of those orders—"while for the other two the rent review applications were filed on 28 September 1990 requesting rent increases of approximately 5% over the guidelines to provide for the financial losses. On the two buildings on which we have orders for rent increases, the rent review services increased the 1989-90 rents by approximately 9.5% to an average rent of \$550 per month for a two-bedroom apartment."

They state, and this is the problem that has been repeated to us in the committees, that if these additional rent increases are not allowed, they will not be able to carry on with these buildings because they lack the financial ability to cover these shortfalls. If two years go by, people like this are going to go bankrupt. We have an obligation as legislators to stop these people from going bankrupt. But this time allocation resolution says: "No we're not going to talk about it any more. To heck with them. Let these people go bankrupt."

1640

Then they summarize the effects of this bill. They state they are unable to pay for cash-flow shortages created by financial loss. "We are finding it difficult"—

Mr Harnick: Turn them away at the door.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Haslam): The member knows if he wishes to voice his opinion he should be in his own seat.

Please continue. I remind the member for Dufferin-Peel that under order 23(d) he is to refrain from reading at length from verbatim reports.

Mr Tilson: Madam Speaker, with due respect to you, I am quoting from statements. I am not reading. There is a distinction. With all due respect to you, that is the distinction that is being made. I have every right to debate this resolution and I have every right to show that this government is wrong in trying to slam this legislation through. I have every right to quote from statements that have been made by the people of this province.

They go on to state the effects of this bill on these people. They state that they are finding it difficult to refinance their mortgages, and that is the problem that has come forward many, many times and needs a debate. When are we going to deal with the people who are having trouble refinancing their mortgages? The mortgages run out. What are we going to do? They need more capital to put capital investment into their buildings, to keep the quality of the buildings up. What are we going to do with

that? We need to debate that. This resolution says, "No, we can't debate it any further."

They say that they are having difficulty refinancing their mortgages "as the building prices have fallen by more than 30% since the rent moratorium announcement." That is not an isolated fact. That fact has come to us time and time again as to how apartment buildings have depreciated in value by different amounts, depending on the area around the province that you are speaking of.

They go on to say: "This fall in prices has made our buildings financed more than the current building prices. We cannot even sell these buildings as the current prices do not even cover the mortgage amounts." What are these people going to do? The buildings have depreciated to such an amount that it is below what the current mortgages are on those buildings.

Fact after fact has been presented to us. We should be debating that. That is an important fact that needs to be discussed. Bill 4 is going to go for two years and we need to stop that. If that is the problem, are we going to let the problem go or are we going to do something about it? How do you do something about it? You make an amendment to the bill or, better yet, you withdraw the bill. But this time allocation resolution precludes us from doing this.

The third effect on these individuals states that their building "will be forced into power of sale at prices lower than the mortgage amounts, which means we will have to pay for the difference personally." As you may or may not know with proceedings, the power of sale proceedings take place and the building is sold for a lesser amount and they are still liable to the mortgagees as a matter of contract. They are liable to those people, so they are still on the hook. They have no building and they have a tremendous debt they have to pay to the previous mortgagees. They have lost the buildings and probably to individuals who are not going to be as conscientious as they are in maintaining those buildings. Hence the quality of life of the tenants is going to go down. What are we going to do about that? The time allocation resolution says, "Sorry, we're not going to talk about it."

As mentioned earlier, they state that their means are very limited and they have no alternative except to declare personal bankruptcy. Here is yet another statement of people saying that if Bill 4 passes they are going to go bankrupt. These are the types of requests that these individuals are making. This was made to us time and time again on the subject of retroactivity and the subject of phase-in orders.

It may well be that rents can be frozen for a short period of time. It is all the surrounding matters that go with it, the issue of retroactivity, the issue of the fact that no capital expenditures can be made. We are completely opposed to the bill, but there are people who, if certain amendments could be made, would still not be content but would not be quite as enraged and certainly would not be quite on the verge of bankruptcy or indeed going bankrupt. But we are not going to be allowed to debate that.

Their suggestions are: Allow previously ordered rent review phase-ins to be implemented; allow the processing of the rent review applications filed prior to the announce-

ment, in other words, the introduction of Bill 4, to proceed according to the law at the time of the application; for buildings purchased prior to the date of the moratorium announcement, allow all existing mortgage amounts to be considered towards calculating the financial loss.

Those are the comments that were made by Nu-West Businesses and Properties, average people trying to make a living and trying to improve the housing market in this province. If Bill 4 continues and the implications from it, they are going to go bankrupt.

That leads me to a subject that we need to spend more time on in this House, time that may result in amendments, time that certainly would result in debate from members on all sides of the House. Of course, the time allocation resolution, if passed, precludes us from doing it. That is the subject of bankruptcy.

We have had individual after individual and groups. We have had people break down in tears at the committee level. That has been repeated by both the Liberal Party and by ourselves. People have broken down and cried because they are going to go bankrupt and the terrible effect it is going to have on their families and everyone connected with them. It is a terrible thing to go bankrupt. This government does not seem to have the compassion to stop that.

David Simmons was one such individual who has put this government on notice that if this bill passes he is going to go bankrupt. We need to spend time on that. He wrote us on 5 February and filed this letter with the hearings. I would like to briefly refer to some of the comments he makes on the subject of bankruptcy.

He states, "Bill 4 and a permanent rent control system will have and has had a devastating effect on myself, my suppliers, my employee and my tenants." That is the point: Bankruptcy affects everyone because commercial transactions are entered into, commercial contracts are entered into, with all kinds of people, aside from the effect it is going to have on the tenants, the individual, the landlord, the banks, the institutions, the suppliers and everyone else. It is a serious matter that needs to be debated but this government is not going to allow us to debate it with its closure motion.

He, therefore, requests that his "views, concerns and circumstances be heard and submitted before the committee for consideration." That is what I intend to do right now because I do not believe we gave him a chance to be heard and we are going to hear him, because this is the type of individual I think this House needs to hear. Further debate, information and facts can be brought to this House to show the economic seriousness that is being developed with Bill 4.

Like a lot of people in this province, he is 30 years old, he is married and has two children. In 1989, he purchased 24 units in an apartment building in Brantford. The rents were low and he realized that he would lose some money in the first couple of years. He looked at the current legislation and he went to the government, got the rent review guidelines and he studied that and studied the rent review system. With some hard work, he was prepared to absorb, by his own personal efforts, the time spent in renovating

these buildings. So he says he was "prepared to absorb by occupying a unit and contributing my family's labour for free, and two or three years I had no doubt in my mind that I would have a very nice, well-maintained building with good tenants, fair rent and breaking even." All he wanted to do was to break even, and his family worked along with him. His family and friends worked along with him.

1650

He studied the rent review system and he relied on it to help raise the rents legally so that they would cover the building expenses, so that they would be breaking even after the first two or three years. He hoped, as did many individuals who came to us, to own this building as a long-term investment as well as trying to find a secure future for his family.

He was not one of these landlords that the government side talks about who is gouging the system. All he was doing was trying to build an investment, like what we are hearing about today; even some of the government members are trying to do it.

He says it has been two years and he has a "very nice, well-maintained building, with good tenants. The rents have not changed accordingly and are still not fair. My costs have increased and I am far from breaking even. We are not looking at making a profit off of the tenants but as a businessman, the rental income must at least provide some percentage of a return on our investment of labour and money. All that we are hoping for is to break even this year, and with the phase-in and a little bit of repayment for our capital expenditures, we would have."

That is the story we heard in many situations and we need to tell the members of this government of these situations that were not relayed to us in the committee, because there are other stories like this that a time allocation resolution precludes us from getting into.

He goes on by saying that in 1989 he lost \$32,423.50; in 1990 he lost \$25,239.19, and to date this year, 1991, and that was as of the early part of February, he has lost over \$6,000, so presumably he has lost even more as 1991 has proceeded.

In September 1990, which was about the time this government took office, he was issued a rent review order, "allowing me a 5% phase-in for April 1990, another 5% for April 1991 and so on until my loss in the first year was brought down to zero. In March 1990, I had to do some major repairs to the roof"—and that is the story when you get buildings in this province, 75% of which are 20 years or older. You have to do that; you cannot let them run down. We need to discuss that and of course this government will not let us, if this resolution is carried.

He had to do some major repairs on the roof in March 1990. That was at a cost of \$18,300, and at the same time he painted all the apartments. This was not a man who was allowing apartments to turn into a slum. He wanted his building to look nice. He wanted the tenants of his building to live in a fair and reasonable way. He said he painted all the apartments that were not all painted in five years or more at a cost of \$3,023.43.

Now he gets to Bill 4 and he starts to tell his story. He states that, as he understands it, he will not get his 5%

phase-in and he will not get anything for these capital expenditures based on the existing rules of the day, based on the existing rules that were established by the province of Ontario, that he relied on until this government took office.

"With Bill 4, we have been stripped of our phase-in and capital expenditure costs, which work out to \$8,000 cash out of our pocket. A person such as Bob Rae might word it a little different and say that he kept the \$8,000 from going into my greedy landlord hands. Well, with Bill 4 he is definitely keeping the \$8,000 from going into my hands. But let's not forget that I am in a negative cash flow position already. That means that another \$8,000 has to come from my pocket to carry the building, or simply reduce the quality of accommodation, or convert it to another use."

In other words, he is considering taking this out of the residential market and putting it into something else, and we need to debate that subject, when landlords are coming and stating that to this House. We need to debate that, but this resolution says, "No, we can't debate that."

He continues: "As for why we do not set sell the building, that was never the plan for the near future. We are trying to hang on through this in hope for better times ahead"—and of course, he is suggesting that the government will come to its senses and withdraw Bill 4—"when maybe we can see a little return on our investment. Besides that, the fact of the matter is that we cannot afford to sell it."

Here is another man who cannot afford to sell his building or he is going to go bankrupt, so the whole subject of bankruptcy needs to be discussed by this House. We cannot do that in two days, along with all the other matters that are being put forward by the two opposition parties, because there is inadequate time. The time allocation resolution clearly will preclude us, because there are no amendments that will come forward as a result of that resolution, if it carries.

He states: "Because of Bill 4, I have already had problems with refinancing. My second mortgage came due and had to be paid off. I tried to increase the first mortgage. At first they were going to incorporate a good portion of it, but by passing Bill 4, I lost my phase-in and the mortgagee held back \$33,000." And so would you, Madam Speaker, if you were a mortgagee. You would do the same thing. You are trying to protect your interests. We need to look at that. We need to study that. But we are not studying it. There is no debate whatsoever on this subject, no debate whatsoever as to how we are going to resolve this matter during this two-year period.

He states, "I have arranged a new second mortgage at extra cost to bridge finance the \$33,000 until the holdback is released from the first mortgagee." He emphasizes that "unfortunately, if Bill 4 goes through and I will not get my phase-in, my first mortgagee will not release the holdback and I will not be able to raise this \$33,000 or continue the expense of bridge financing or will lose the building, and the tenants will lose their homes as they know it."

There are several issues in that statement that we need to discuss further, because we have not discussed it. I think

it is becoming quite apparent that if two days are allowed to deal with the amendments, and no other amendments, we will have not have time. I would recommend that all members vote against this resolution.

He then talks about his expenses, and that is something of course that will come forward in the amendments I referred to, the subject of necessary expenses, an amendment that my party was suggesting and which has not been discussed. We need time to discuss that. There may be other areas as time goes on, but with the resolution there will be no more amendments allowed. "Take it as it is. We are not going to listen to anything else that you have to say. We're not even going to listen to our own backbenchers," even though I am sure they have people coming to them and telling them the problems they have in their own ridings.

He says:

"In addition, expenses are rising higher than the guideline rent increase. My hydro went up 8.84% plus 7% GST; my water went up 16%; my sewer charge went up over 55%; garbage removal costs went from \$27 per lift—and that is something the government will not allow us to introduce, that is the purpose of our amendment—"to over \$41.52 per lift and GST now, which is a 64.56% increase; my property taxes are being reassessed and with the mill rate increase, they have a potential of going up by 20%; most of my supplies have gone up 6% plus GST; the interest rate on my second mortgage has jumped from 10% to 14.5%, and my total increase of financing has increased by 6%. I have payments of \$579 per month on a personal loan which was obtained to pay for the roof repairs and the painting."

1700

The government may say that some of these items are in this "necessary expense" clause that it has—and it is true that some of them are—but that means the rent is going to go up. The rent that the government is alleging is going to be frozen is not going to be frozen because of these things. The rent is going to go up. Even with this bill it is going to go up.

Not only that but some of these items are not in that clause that is being proposed by the government. We have the right to put forward an amendment to that section and be allowed to debate it. But this time allocation resolution says, "No, we've talked about it enough, we're not going to talk about it any more;" even though we have not talked about it.

He says:

"In short, none of my expenses have increased less than the maximum guideline rent increase which Bill 4 will limit me to. The above percentage increases average out to an increase of 19.49%. When compared to the 5.4% guideline increase there is a difference of 14.09%."

We have a problem on the one hand of how these expenses are going to be covered, and on the other hand the tenant obviously has major problems in paying for these. Some tenants have major problems dealing with these; a lot of tenants do not, and we have talked about that. But this government does not want to talk about that issue. This government has said, "We're going to force this

time allocation motion down your throats and we're not allowing you to talk about those subjects at all."

It is a very complicated issue as to how we are going to deal with that subject. The government has come along and said, "Oh well, we'll deal with it with our permanent legislation," whenever that comes. That is after the green paper debate, whenever that comes. I do not know whether we are going to have any more consultation on that. At one point the committee was going to discuss it, but there does not appear to be any sign that the committee is going to discuss it.

In regard to the so-called consultations that the minister has described with respect to the green paper—some of which were in private, some of which were in public and most of which had no debate between the minister and the constituents—I assume that process has ended, whatever that process was. I have never seen a process like that described in this province. I do not know what it was. I think it was a scam. The whole process is a scam when you think of it, how we have been stopped at every point from dealing with this whole issue, even up to this current resolution.

He says: "I am very lucky to have a full-time job so that I can support my building. But who is going to support my wife and kids?" That is something this government has not thought of, and we should talk about it. "If I don't or can't do maintenance and repairs, what happens when the property standards board comes around and tells me that I have to comply with the property standards bylaw or I need major repairs done? I do not have a reserve fund set up nor can I afford to set one up in the near future."

The government has given hints about that. They talked about that, and who knows what they are going to do with their permanent legislation, which I suspect is already drafted, I suspect it is already drafted even though we really have not gone through an adequate consultation process. The whole subject of reserve funds did crop up. It is a subject that could be canvassed in this debate, but we are not going to be allowed to canvass it. If the government feels that there should be a reserve fund set up, then let it make an amendment now. The resolution says no more amendments. That is the end of it.

He says:

"I am not the only landlord affected by the devastating effects that Bill 4 will have. Rental legislation of this kind will annihilate the rental stock in Ontario. Bankruptcy, layoffs and foreclosures will result in the deterioration in the quality of those buildings that survive. Most of us will abandon rental premises and tenants will be forced to buy or go out into a shrinking market to find similar rental accommodation which will likely be new housing not yet strangled by the rent control noose."

It is a very dismal outlook that we have in this province. There is a golden opportunity for this government to do something about it. Yet the government says, "Do it our way, but we're not going to let you talk about it, we're not going to listen to your suggestions." Therefore, they are going to ram this time allocation resolution down our throats. We will not be allowed to introduce any further

suggestions that might stop this pessimistic outlook that is developing in the housing industry.

He states: "I really need that phase-in. All of the tenants were expecting it and didn't complain about it." That is another factor. What happens when tenants agree with these types of things? What happens when tenants even ask for them? They want items to be done to their building. They want capital expenditures to be made to their building, capital renovations. They asked the landlord and they agreed to it.

We have an amendment that we are prepared to put forward. It was defeated in committee; the government defeated it in committee. Hopefully they have reconsidered it since and we will have an opportunity to provide the facts that we had then, as well as new information that we have, to this committee, to persuade the government to allow for that. But the time allocation resolution says: "No, you've got two days to debate what's on the floor and that's it. No new resolutions. That's the end of it."

He states: "My rents are \$379.11 for a large two-bedroom and \$347.78 for a large one-bedroom. If rent controls or the guidelines were abolished I would raise my rents to \$550 for a two-bedroom and \$475 for a one-bedroom, and not have any difficulty in getting or keeping existing tenants." That seems to be a going rate that we have heard. Clearly his rents are far below what the average rents are in his area, and facts have been produced on that, but unfortunately, because of this legislation, he is stuck.

He states: "Even my tenants are regretting Bill 4 because they are not getting their new carpets or new appliances now. Just about every one of them is willing to pay a little extra." He has spoken to his tenants and they are prepared to pay a little extra to get these items. Bill 4 says: "No way. You can't get them. You can get them but you will have to find some other source of paying for them because you cannot get them through increased rents."

We should be allowed to debate that subject, because that is a factor that Bill 4 does not deal with. We have an amendment that we are prepared to put forward, that we are prepared to introduce. It is on the table and we are prepared to discuss that, but this government does not want to hear it. They will not allow us to debate it.

He lists his bare minimum costs to operate his building. That "does not include the standard accepted amounts for 1% for vacancy, 1% for legal and audit, 3% for management and mainly does not include 9% for a return on investment." These are items that Bill 4 does not deal with. Yes, Bill 4 lists off necessary expenses. We believe there is room for amendments to that section. We should have an opportunity to make those amendments as time goes on in the debate, but the debate is not going to take place if this resolution carries. It is not going to be allowed, because it is going to end. Closure is going to come in, and that is the end of it.

He states: "I have 12 two-bedroom apartments and 12 one-bedroom apartments. The proportion of the total rental income for the two-bedroom apartments is 54.5043%, leaving 45.4957% as the one-bedroom proportion."

Using the costs that he has listed—costs for utilities, insurance, property tax, garbage removal, snow, grass re-

moval, maintenance, mortgage payments, loan payments, those sorts of things—at a break-even point, at the above one- and two-bedroom proportions, he will need a rental income of \$76,987 from the two-bedroom apartments and \$64,263.15 from the one-bedrooms. This works out to a monthly rental of \$534.64 for a two-bedroom and \$446.27 for a one-bedroom.

Remember what he is paying. He is paying \$379.11 for a large two-bedroom and \$347.78 for a large one-bedroom. That is just to break even. This is not a gouging landlord whom this government has talked about. All he wants to do is break even, to develop an investment through time. He is prepared to work at it. He is prepared to use his own sweat, his family's own sweat and labour, to maintain this building. We need to discuss that type of landlord. We need to discuss it, but we are not being allowed to discuss it because of this time allocation resolution.

This means that he is absorbing the difference of \$36,578 between the tenants' cost of accommodation and the rental income. That is a lot of money, \$36,578.88, and that is all just in one year, this year, 1991. He feels that he probably ranks "right up there with the Brant and Brantford Housing Authority or some other government agency for supplying subsidized housing." He ranks right up there.

1710

Clearly, these people have the government behind them. The government will cover this loss, at the cost to the taxpayer, but if the private enterprise guy has losses, that is tough. He is out of luck. He has to go bankrupt, and there is the devastating effect it has on the employees and the workers and the banking institutions and the suppliers and everyone else who is involved. But if you are involved in subsidized housing, there is no problem. That is a problem we need to discuss. We need to canvass that whole area, and this time allocation resolution says we cannot do it.

He says, "This is not fair, because most of my tenants have a higher gross income than I do."

We heard that a lot, landlords who came to us and said that they are working personally on these buildings, are doing their own labour, are providing their own funds, are sticking their own necks out, are mortgaging their houses, and the tenants are making more than they are.

That is not fair, and again it gets back to that question I have been asking the parliamentary assistant, the Minister of Housing and the Premier, who shuffles off to the Minister of Housing. I have been asking that question. Is this bill fair? Is the whole concept of it even fair? We need to spend time on that, but this government has had enough. They do not want to talk about it, because it is too hot. They cannot stand the demonstrations they have been receiving. The minister has been burned once. He does not want to be burned again.

He states, "If your response"—and of course his response is the response of the committee, or indeed the Minister of Housing—"is to provide affordable housing for those who cannot afford to pay a market value, why don't you identify those who need such assistance and provide it directly, rather than providing an economic advantage to all persons?"

Do members notice how we get back to this in almost all the submissions that are made to us? This keeps coming back, and yet this government will not debate it. They are helping the wrong people. They are not even helping the people who they think they are helping. They are not even helping the 30% of the tenants who cannot afford any rent increases. They are helping the rich. They are helping the people who can afford the rents. These people think it is great. Their rents are frozen. They can go off and they can have fancy cars and go away on trips that the landlord, a small landlord, never thought of doing. It is not fair.

He states that, "The average rent in Brantford in 1990 was \$485 and the vacancy rate in Brantford is 0.8%." He states that: "It has been on a steady decline since the Residential Rent Regulation Act was introduced. This is directly related to the decline in the building of rental accommodations since the act was introduced."

This government slammed the Liberal government for having that legislation, Bill 51. It spent many hours slamming it, and this is what it can come up with. It is even worse than Bill 51.

Mr Fletcher: That's right.

Mr Tilson: But this is what they contend, "It's right." Is that their answer? Is that what their solution is? After hearing response after response as to how people are going bankrupt, they are saying it is right? The member for Guelph should listen more and read some of the Hansard as to the terrible stories that have been going on in this province.

He goes on by saying, "Just because a few landlords have taken advantage of some tenants is no reason to make my life miserable."

That is what is happening. This government does not care. It is a government that does not care, and we need to hold it accountable. We need to hold them accountable, but we are not being given the opportunity to do that.

"You don't see marble lobbies in my building, but what you do see is a new carpet in the halls at my expense."

That was not allowed through rent review, but he put new carpets in his halls anyway. That is the type of man this is. He put in a recently repaired roof and every apartment is freshly painted, hallways, windows, laundry rooms, etc, are cleaned weekly, bathrooms caulked, maintenance current and complete.

There is no question we have heard a lot of very sad stories of tenants who are already living in slums. Bill 4 does not deal with them, but Bill 4 deals with this type of person. Bill 4 says: "You're out of luck. You can go bankrupt."

This man says, "Everything that a landlord is supposed to do, should do and more," he has done. "I have followed, abided by and in some cases surpassed all of the rules, regulations, bylaws and standards. Now the rules have changed after the fact."

That is what we in this party do not like. The rules have changed after the fact and we want a chance to debate this with this government as to how wrong it is and how the retroactive provision should be withdrawn. We have an amendment that we would like to have an opportunity to

debate, and clearly the time allocation motion will not allow us to adequately deal with that.

He states: "Someone made a good comment the other day. It went like this: If you are going to stop a few people from poaching animals you don't kill all the animals. That's what is being done to us landlords. We are being killed because a few landlords were taking advantage." We all saw there are a few landlords who took advantage of the situation. This government's solution to it is: "Kill all the landlords. Do away with all the landlords, all the fat, cigar-smoking landlords."

That is the image that they have been painting and it is unfair and it is untrue. It is a myth that needs to be corrected, and this party over here is prepared to do it, but the government will not give us the chance to do it. They are going to introduce a time allocation resolution and they are going to cut us off. They are going to muzzle us.

He proceeds to say: "Rent review legislation is cumbersome and impossible for the layman to understand. Tenants and landlords get frustrated with the confusing and repetitive allocation increase system. I admit that the rent review system needs some work, but to stick Bill 4 in stopping everything retroactively while a new system is worked out is very damaging and unfair and increases uncertainty."

Now that is a valid statement. The government has said that the existing system is unfair—we have said it is unfair—and it says it needs some time to study it, although it had lots of answers last year in the election. Well, we need to debate that. We need to debate why, if they had an idea last summer, where did that idea go? We are already six months into their term and nothing has happened. We have a devastating Bill 4 and we have seen a green paper which we are not allowed to debate. Public hearings and semi-public hearings and private meetings are being held with the Minister of Housing, but we are not being allowed. Question after question has been raised in this House, and that is an example, and this resolution caps all of that. It caps the discussion. The discussion is over. We think that is wrong and we think that is unfair, as is Bill 4 and all of the proposals put forward by this government.

He states, "If Premier Bob Rae is troubled by some landlords doing luxury renovations and passing the cost off to the tenants that don't want them, then define luxury renovations and put a clause in the current act disallowing any reimbursement or recognition of those types of renovations."

What is a luxury renovation? Those guys seem to know what it is. Why do they not tell us? Why do they not let us debate it with them? They do not know, and that is why they are cutting us off, because they do not want to talk about it. They have raised the issue, but they do not want to talk about it any more.

"But if a fridge stops working or a carpet wears sooner than expected, allow the landlord to recover their expenses." That is all he is asking.

"Someone may ask the question, what other industry is guaranteed a yearly increase? Well, if the cap was taken off the rents, leaving them up to the market to decide, we wouldn't need the guideline increases. People would build rental accommodations and tenants would pay what they

"It was fair for rent for a particular unit or not rent it." That whole concept needs to be debated further, but, no, that is the end of it.

"Someone may ask the question, what other industry is guaranteed a return on their money?" He says: "I'm not getting a return on my money. The only return that I'm going to see on my investment is the return of my building to my first mortgagee." That is his return. The building is going to the first mortgagee.

720

Sure, there are some bad things going on out there and some bad landlords. The government should not take this out on all the landlords. Why can we not talk about that? Has the government taken account of how many tenants have taken advantage and skipped out without paying their rent or after causing damages? Clearly, there is a problem in the whole housing industry and the whole rental accommodation. There are bad landlords and there are bad tenants. Why can we not have legislation that is going to deal with everyone? Why are we going to put the landlords out of business? Why are we going to force them into bankruptcy? We need to debate that and we are not being allowed to debate it because of this resolution.

"If the NDP is concerned about flipping, then define what you mean by 'flipping' and write something into the act to disallow it." That is a reasonable request. Why can the government not put forward an amendment to do that? This legislation says: "No more amendments, not even our amendments. We're not even allowed to amend." That is what they are saying. I hope the government does not mean that everyone who owns a building must now keep it and no one else can ever buy one, or else they may be labelled "flippers."

He states:

"Also, this payment of money owing to the landlord by the tenant as a result of an order by instalments if passed will be another damaging thing. I could see this only being fair if the amount owed to the landlord is a large one like \$300 or \$400. This would mean that I'd have to wait even longer for the needed extra money by having it paid in instalments. And to have it legal for a tenant to still owe me instalments even though they have left the apartment, province or country is just ridiculous."

That is another subject that needs to be debated, but this resolution says: "No, you can't talk about it any more. You can't even make amendments on that subject."

He says: "I can just see them piling up in a limo"—sounds like government cabinet ministers—"from out of town and lining up at my door to pay their instalment. Oh, but let's not forget, I get to write this off as a bad debt." I have news for him. He is wrong. He cannot write it off as a bad debt. That was established by the housing staff who said, "No, you can't write it off as a bad debt." So he is wrong. We need to debate the fact that landlords cannot write off their losses. "Just what I need: another expense to write off. I'd rather have the cash, thanks."

He says in conclusion:

"In brief, and with a God-like stroke of a pen, my family is on the verge of bankruptcy; my mortgage financing is in jeopardy; my rent review order is now void and

the time invested in formulating is wasted; my approved phase-in is cancelled; the value of my building is reduced as a residential complex; I have increased the standard of living for my tenants with over \$21,000 in non-recoverable capital expenditures for free; and am now in a new ballpark playing a game without knowing the rules, and because of retroactivity find that I have just struck out before going to bat."

This shows the frustration of the landlords in this province because of the retroactive nature of this legislation. Clearly, if the government has not understood what the people of this province have been saying and what the opposition members are saying, we need more time to do that. We need more time to talk about that. Clearly they need more time. The facts that have been given to them appear to be not enough.

The issue of retroactivity is probably the most damaging of all the clauses in the bill. It has an effect, as I have indicated, on a whole slew of things: an effect on the subject of unemployment; an effect on the subject of contracts that are broken; an effect on the financial institutions; an effect on safety; an effect on research and development. All of those items were presented to us in a brief, a joint submission by the Steeplejack and Masonry Restoration Contractors Association and the Operative Plasterers and Cement Masons' International Association, Local 172, restoration steeplejacks. That was made to us in January.

They talked about the short-term concerns of Local 172 regarding this legislation. I think we need to listen to unions such as this. We need to listen to unions such as this because obviously this government is not listening to the unions. They talked about the problem of unemployment and they state:

"On 1 December 1990, Local 172 had a 3.2% unemployment rate. As of Monday 14 January 1991, we were experiencing an unemployment rate of 60%. This represents an increase in unemployment of 1,875% in less than two months. That is all related to job-site shutdowns and cancellations." It is not the recession that the Minister of Housing has spoken of; it is a result of job-site shutdowns and cancellations.

They state:

"I expect the unemployment rate and the restoration sector to soar to 85% by the end of January. In addition to these already staggering unemployment figures, there is a ripple effect even within Local 172. The related industrial sector...companies that manufacture and rent suspended access equipment have traditionally never had layoffs." They are suggesting that because of Bill 4 they now are.

They state:

"In the past week, for the first time the industrial sector went from zero unemployment to 7%. These layoffs were directly related to lost jobs in the restoration sector. More layoffs are expected in the industrial sector. Because both the restoration and industrial sectors are skilled tradespeople with families to support and rents and mortgages to pay, a layoff beyond March of this year could see these valued workers lost to this industry for ever."

So not only are we talking about unemployment, but we are talking about the destruction of the restoration industry

and how it is going to be gone. These skilled people are going to be gone for ever. They are going to go into other industries and it is all because of Bill 4. We need to discuss that topic in detail. We need to provide more information to the government to try to stop this from happening.

The second point that was raised was the subject of finance, and they state: "A reduced workforce puts a financial burden on the local, while a lost workforce threatens the local's viability. Programs and activities will have to be reduced and/or cut entirely."

We need to discuss that. This is a union that is raising these issues, the union that this government claims has its support. They talk about their apprenticeship program and the effect it has had on that program. Due to the lack of major funding or sanctions of the program, it will have to be eliminated. So the building up of skilled workers, the training of the skilled workers, the keeping up with the industry, keeping the industry alive, all that is going to stop. Why would the restoration industry continue with this if nothing is going to happen for two years? They cannot keep these people on. They cannot train people to get into this business. Why would they do that? We need to debate that, and the time allocation resolution says that we are not going to do that.

The fourth point they raised deals with organizing. They say that "Local 172 has had to put its organizing efforts on hold, thus losing the momentum and cost of the campaign." That is a sad thing. This union is in trouble because of this government, because of Bill 4.

Safety is a subject that unions are concerned with, the landlords are concerned with, the cement people are concerned with. That is a subject we need to spend a great deal of time on, because they say that because of these cancelled contracts the structural integrity of the buildings is at risk, thus creating a safety hazard.

We cannot have a safety hazard, and amendments would need to be put forward in this bill that would allow landlords the ability to stop the safety hazards from arising. But we are not going to be allowed to debate that. This is being rammed through. They have had enough. They do not want to talk about it any more. They created a situation of uncertainty. They have created a crisis and they do not want to talk about it. They brought this crisis forward and they say: "That's it. We've left you with a crisis but we're not going to deal with it any more."

Sixth, they have talked about the research and development issue. They state: "Ontario's temperate location has made it ideal for research and development of materials and procedures. Manufacturers and suppliers will feel the ripple effect of unemployment and lack of contracts in the restoration sector. Ontario could lose the research and development for which this industry has become world renowned." All this because of Bill 4. There is a need to debate this subject. The time allocation resolution says no, and we need to debate it.

1730

This report from the union comments, "Although the short-term effects that the recent legislation has had on Local 172 and its membership has been costly, the long-term effects would be disastrous."

The items I referred to are the short-term effects. They do not want to talk about the short-term effects. Well let's just issue some of the long-term effects and whether they are prepared to do that.

The union talks about the amendment of the rent review process. Their members have had 15 projects stopped, cancelled or put on hold indefinitely. To this union this has meant the permanent layoff of 60 men. Employment among the companies of their association on 17 January 1991 was only 36% of what it was on 17 January 1990. This represents only the work carried over from 1990.

The comment that has been made by the Minister of Housing that this whole issue of unemployment has been caused by the recession is inadequate. These people are relating it to Bill 4. Naturally, the government is finding it embarrassing, so therefore, put closure, shut us up. We are going to raise examples as to how devastating this Bill 4 is going to be on the employment of people such as this Local 172, and therefore let's stop talking about it. Let's not hear from groups such as Local 172. Let's shut them down.

Now, the union says that this is only the beginning of 1991, and not all the work to be done this year would have been tendered, but already members of their association know of almost \$10 million worth of work in the rental sector which had been scheduled and is now cancelled because of Bill 4. This \$10 million, it says, "translated into human terms represents 206,000 lost man-hours of work, 5,150 lost man-weeks of work, 103 lost man-years of work." This was only on 17 January 1991, less than two months since these amendment had been introduced.

"Another very important point that must be put into perspective is the fact that our association and Local 172 are only a very small segment of the restoration sector." So this is only a small portion. We have an obligation to listen to everyone. This is only one small sector that is affecting the unemployment of this province. If there is one, there are two, there are three, there are four. The Progressive Conservative Party wants to talk about that and about how this bill is causing unemployment in this province, but this government does not want to listen.

The lost jobs that Local 172 talks about here are highly skilled, well-paid jobs in a labour-intensive service industry that simply do not have to be lost. But Bill 4 is creating job losses in this specialized industry. Not only that, they are not training to keep the industry alive. The union states that there are hundreds of buildings in the province that require major restoration work done to them. When we hear facts like this, why will this government not let us talk about it? Why are they shutting us up? Why are they asking that this resolution be passed to shut us down? We were not allowed to talk about it in the committee. We were cut off in the committee. We could not allow for it any further.

Interjections.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Order, please. There are a number of interjections from members who are not even in their own seats. Of course interjections are out

of order, particularly when they come from members who are not in their own seats. The honourable member who has the floor may proceed.

Mr Tilson: Continuing on with the concerns of Local 172, it states, "When I think about these lost jobs, I reflect upon what Premier Bob Rae said on 11 January while addressing the Financial Services Institute." They quote the Premier, who said on 11 January, "Everybody, including the financial institutions, must understand that jobs are important." The Premier said—and here they are paraphrasing—that the government of Ontario was not going to stand by and allow jobs to be lost during the recession, even if that meant a higher deficit. He later went on to say that he expected the financial institutions to pull together with the government in saving jobs—and again they quote the Premier—to "play an effective role in fighting the recession." He also said, "I am stressing the importance of partnership."

Here is the Premier of this province mentioning the issues that this side of the House wants to talk about, and yet the resolution says no. The Premier has raised the issues, but he will not let us talk about it. They have shut us down.

The union concludes by saying it "would also like to stress the importance of partnership." We have to work together and find a way to put these men back to work." Bill 4 certainly is not doing it and I believe with the appropriate amendments and possibly even the withdrawal of Bill 4, that we can develop a solution. "Whether this means allowing the landlords to capitalize the cost of structural restoration work through the rent review process, or some form of tax credit, or a type of granting process, it matters not to us how this is worked out."

They are offering some suggestions. They are offering suggestions such as a form of tax credit, a type of granting process. I believe that with further debate, we would be able to raise this and perhaps make suggestions to the Bill legislation or even suggest that Bill 4 should be defeated and that the government should get on with the permanent legislation and allow solutions to this housing problem to be created. But no, they will not allow us to talk any more.

The union continues by stating: "It matters not to us how this is worked out. But it's absolutely imperative that we work in partnership to find a solution so that we may put these skilled trademen back to work without delay" and to develop, to encourage more people to get into the restoration business and train them.

I would like to conclude—

Mr McLean: Conclude?

Mr Tilson: Yes.

Mr Stockwell: No.

Mr Tilson: I would like to conclude by one final statement that I believe should be considered by the members of this House as an example of other statements that could be introduced to show the problems that have been created by Bill 4 and how we need more time to introduce further information and facts to this House.

This came to us from Alfred Diesner from Scarborough.

"I own a rental property in Scarborough which contains 50 suites and I have owned this property for 20 years. I have attempted to offer better than average maintained accommodation for my tenants and have only applied to rent review when major expenditures were required.

"I made application in 1982 to recover the cost for replacement of plumbing risers, appliances, installation of an updated fire alarm system and installation of a compacter. All these costs were incurred to improve the standard of living for my tenants."

That is the type of information—because obviously this government has the wrong impression that all landlords are bad. Most of the landlords who came to us want to improve the situation of the tenants, they want to maintain their buildings. They do not want them to turn into the slums of New York. They do not want that to happen.

Mr Diesner says: "For the past eight years I have been taking the allowance provided by law annually, and have maintained the building on that basis. This past year, once again the building required more major work. I commenced the work in September of 1989 and completed the work in July of 1990.

"This work entailed replacing the roof, replacing the windows and doors, repaving the entire parking lot, replacing the chimney, replacing the intercom as well as replacing the railing to comply with bylaw changes." These are not the marble foyers that this individual is trying to do. This is trying to make his building look better for the tenants.

1740

He concludes by saying:

"Upon completing this program, I applied to rent review to recover these extraordinary costs. While awaiting the decision from rent review services, I was informed that my application would not be processed and that a moratorium on all rent increases will be applied retroactively to 1 October 1990, even if capital expenditures were completed and paid for long before this government came to power."

This is the very amendment that we are debating currently in this House, the amendment that is put forward by the member for Eglinton, about which this resolution says: "No more. Let's stop talking about it."

The minister has repeatedly stated that he wished to protect tenants from financial hardship. As the government for the people, I find it hard to believe this same concern would not be extended to the landlords. He wants fairness and we have a right, we have an obligation to debate fairness in this House, and this government says, "No, we're not going to talk about that any more, even though we're unfair."

"I have incurred a debt of approximately \$225,000 to improve the quality of my tenants' homes according to the laws in place and now this retroactive legislation will place me in financial hardship. I invested in this property in the hope that the revenue will provide me with a retirement income and at the same time I will be providing over 50 tenants with a reasonable place to live. The major setback would eliminate the possibility of providing for me this retirement income.

"I have also read that the minister suggests that if we are having difficulty, we have the alternative of selling our building. After owning this building for 20 years, barely managing to make ends meet through the years when I was losing money, and managing to provide decent accommodation when my mortgage interest rate reached 15%, I find it outrageous that the minister would recommend selling this property today at a value far less than its value in 1986; that is, if I could find a purchaser."

We should be discussing this. We should be discussing and debating this in detail and this government says no. Mr Diesner concludes by saying:

"The average three-bedroom apartment rents for approximately \$635 per month. My average two-bedroom apartment rents for approximately \$530 per month and the average one-bedroom rents for approximately \$460 per month. These rents are far below those charged for similar units in this area and are certainly affordable for my tenants. I find it difficult to see the equity in depriving me of justified rent increases after I have incurred such a substantial debt in good faith.

"In this circumstance, I believe Bill 4 will not help my tenants have a better-maintained accommodation and will certainly hurt my ability to finally retire on a moderate income."

Those are just some of the stories that have been told to the committee and that have not been told to the committee. Those that have not been told to the committee we believe that we have the right and the obligation to bring forward as examples of why this bill should be defeated.

This time allocation motion precludes us from doing that and I therefore ask the members of this House on all sides to defeat this resolution and allow us to get on with the debate to try to solve the housing crisis in this province.

Hon Mr Cooke: This is the third day that we have listened to the opposition and particularly the Conservative Party in its deliberate efforts to prevent Bill 4 from passing and to prevent tenants from being adequately protected in this province.

Bill 4 was introduced on 28 November 1990. It is a temporary piece of legislation and it expresses the desire of this government to adequately protect tenants and to set the time frame whereby we as a government can develop, in co-operation with the people of this province, the permanent legislation.

As temporary legislation, clearly the four months that it has taken to get to this point by trying to pass Bill 4 is unacceptable to us as a government and, I believe, unacceptable to the people of this province.

Clearly, the parliamentary process has to be allowed to work, and the tactics that have been used by the Conservative Party in this Legislature are clearly in line with the tactics that have been used by Fair Rental and by AFFORD. Whether it is the kinds of advertisements that were taken out in the Wall Street Journal or whether it was the extreme tactics that were used by the landlords' group out in front of the Legislature a couple of weeks ago, those kinds of extreme tactics are being used by the Conservative Party in the Legislature as well.

There are 100,000 apartment units in this province that will be protected by Bill 4 that were not protected in any way under Bill 51, the Liberal legislation.

The temporary bill, as I said, was introduced on 28 November. We had a good, lengthy second reading of the bill and discussion in this Legislature. We had public hearings in the general government committee where many people were listened to and the Legislature had an opportunity to deal with the bill clause by clause.

We then had a report back to the Legislature from the committee and the report from the committee was debated for two days, which is an unusual procedure in itself and was part of the delay tactics by the Conservative Party. We then had discussion in committee of the whole House, and it was clear in committee of the whole House that no progress was being made because of the delay tactics by the Conservative Party.

The Conservative Party forced the government to bring in time allocation. Then the time allocation motion gets to be debated and we have now had three days on the motion to set out the time frame to deal with this bill in an orderly way in the Legislature.

I find it very strange that the Conservative Party has the nerve to come into this place and tell us that we are not consulting, when right from day one their position is, eliminate rent controls. How did they come to that conclusion? They did not consult the people of this province. We are interested in developing a permanent system of rent control in this province that will work.

Bill 4 is a temporary bill and must be put in place now. The Conservative Party is putting thousands of tenants at risk by delaying this bill. It is up to this Legislature to act. It is absolutely essential that the Legislature act. We have had adequate discussion on the time allocation motion and therefore, under the standing orders of this Legislature, move that this question be now put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Is it the pleasure of the House that the question be now put.

1801

The House divided on Mr Cooke's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes—60

Abel, Akande, Boyd, Buchanan, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Copper, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopj, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Morrow, Murdoch, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E. Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Warl, Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F. Winner, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays—34

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Carr, Cleary, Conway, Cunningham, Elston, Eves, Harnick, Henderson, Jordan, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLean, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neil, H., O'Neil

Y., Phillips, G., Poole, Scott, Sola, Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Wilson, J.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Miss Martel has moved resolution 16. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Call in the members.

1809

The Acting Speaker: Order, please. Could all members take their seats. There has been a request that the time allocation vote take place on Thursday 18 April at 3:45 in the afternoon. A vote on time allocation will therefore take place on Thursday at 3:45 in the afternoon.

CHILD AND FAMILY SUPPORT STATUTE LAW
AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LES LOIS RELATIVES AUX
OBLIGATIONS ALIMENTAIRES

Hon Miss Martel: I would ask for unanimous consent of the House for the order for third reading of Bill 17 to be discharged and the bill to be referred to committee of the whole House.

Agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

Le projet de loi est déposé au comité plénier de la Chambre.

The House adjourned at 1811.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
17	718	1	45	For my second question, I would like to

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Draiville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Fives, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Garnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Gawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Gerguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Gletcher, Derek	Cuelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Gaeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
ffer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
wens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
erruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
hilip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
hillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
ilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
irier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
bole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
ouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
ae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
amsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
izzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
unciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
uprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
cott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
lipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
ola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
orbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
erling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
ockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
ullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
utherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
warbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
lson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
arnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
illeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
'ard, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
'ard, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
'ark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
'arner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
'aters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
'essenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
'hite, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
'ildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
'ilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
'ilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
'ilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
'inninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
'iseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
'itmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Peter Kormos, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 17 April 1991

Members' statements		
Oath of allegiance	753	
Mr H. O'Neil		
Small business	754	
Mr Arnott		
Bygmunt Sojka	754	
Mr Hansen		
St Catharines Standard	754	
Mr Bradley		
Social work	754	
Mr Jackson		
Cancer Treatment Centre	755	
Ms S. Murdock		
Scar Dexter Brooks	755	
Ms Poole		
Recycling policy	755	
Mr Tilson		
Landslide in Scarborough	755	
Mr Owens		
Statement by the ministry		
Conflict of interest	756	
Mr Rae		
Responses		
Conflict of interest	756	
Mr Scott		
Mr Harnick		
Mr Sterling		
Oral questions		
Child care	757	
Mr Nixon		
Ms Akande		
Conflict of interest	758	
Mr Scott		
Mr Rae		
Oath of allegiance	760	
Mr Harris		
Mr Rae		
Conduct of Premier's staff	762	
Mr Mahoney		
Mr Rae		
Hunting in Algonquin Park	763	
Mr McLean		
Mr Wildman		
Ontario produce	763	
Mrs MacKinnon		
Mr Buchanan		
Hunting in Algonquin Park	764	
Mr Ramsay		
Mr Wildman		
Report by committee		
Standing committee on administration of justice	764	
Mr White		
Agreed to	764	
First reading		
John Graves Simcoe Memorial Foundation Repeal Act,		
1991, Bill 73	765	
Mr Marchese		
Agreed to	765	
Government motion		
Time allocation, motion 16	765	
Mr Tilson	765	
Mr Cooke	786	
Vote deferred	787	
Other business		
Oath of allegiance	753	
Mr J. Wilson		
Oath of allegiance	756	
Mr H. O'Neil		
Visitor	756	
The Speaker		
Adjournment	787	
Erratum	788	
Lists of members		
Members and their responsibilities	789	
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	792	

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 17 avril 1991

Rapport émanant d'un comité parlementaire		Première lecture
Comité permanent de l'administration de la justice . . .	764	Loi de 1991 abrogeant la Loi intitulée The John Graves
M. White		Simcoe Memorial Foundation Act, 1965,
Adoptée	764	projet de loi 73 765
		M. Marchese
		Adoptée 765



9 1991

19 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 18 April 1991

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 18 avril 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 18 April 1991

The House met at 1000.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

INTERVENOR FUNDING PROJECT AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE PROJET D'AIDE FINANCIÈRE AUX INTERVENANTS

Mr Chiarelli moved second reading of Bill 39, An Act to amend the Intervenor Funding Project Act, 1988.

M. Chiarelli propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 39, Loi portant modification de la Loi de 1988 sur le projet d'aide financière aux intervenants.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 4(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for his presentation.

Mr Chiarelli: On 20 December 1990 I introduced this amendment for first reading and today we are debating it in second reading. Briefly, the Intervenor Funding Project Act, which was enacted in 1988 by this Legislature, provides that in hearings before two boards, the Environmental Assessment Board and the Ontario Energy Board, it is possible for groups in the public interest to apply for intervenor funding.

The purposes of my amendment are as follows, and I will go through them. They are quite brief, but I think very significant. The definition of "board" in section 1 of the Intervenor Funding Project Act, 1988 would be repealed and the following substituted:

"'board' means a joint board, the Ontario Energy Board, the Environmental Assessment Board or the Ontario Municipal Board."

What that would do is add to the inclusion of this act the Ontario Municipal Board as an eligible board for which intervenor funding might be awarded.

The second amendment is to change the definition of "proponent" in section 1. The existing definition would be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"'proponent' means a party whose undertaking, in the opinion of a funding panel, is the subject matter of the hearing or another party, individual or corporation, who, in the opinion of a funding panel, is potentially a major beneficiary of the decision of the board."

What that amendment would do is expand the definition of "proponent" so that it is not restricted to a group, an individual or a corporation that would receive a financial benefit, so that conceivably it could include as a proponent a municipality or some government agency.

When the Intervenor Funding Project Act was first enacted in 1988, it was voted in with the support of all parties in the Legislature. I might add that this identical amendment which is being proposed today was introduced in the last session by me, was debated in the House, given

approval on second reading and referred to committee of the whole.

At that time, I might add, all parties and all speakers voted in favour of my amendments. There was a very broad consensus that the amendments that I was proposing were in fact very useful and ought to become the law of Ontario.

Of course, the second reading approval died on Orders and Notices when the 1990 election was called. I felt strongly enough about this particular issue so that in December 1990, in the current session, I reintroduced the amendments.

I might add that when the original legislation was before the Legislature by the previous government, essentially the same amendments that I proposed in the last session and in fact that are proposed again, were moved by the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore who was then the Environment critic and who is now the Minister of the Environment. She spoke very eloquently when the bill was passed in 1988 to add an amendment similar to mine.

In order to put these amendments in context, it is very important that we look at the Ontario Municipal Board and how it operates and functions. The Ontario Municipal Board is a quasi-judicial body which makes very important decisions on quality of life and environmental concerns in the area of planning and development.

The board, as it has developed over the years, has developed rules of evidence as a court, rules of procedure as a court, and in its deliberations it gives the greatest weight in evidence to experts who come before it: expert planners, expert legal counsel, expert environmentalists, expert engineers. It is a very technical and usually very largely financed board in its hearings.

As I mentioned, the types of cases, usually the major cases before it, deal with environmental concerns and quality of life concerns. It deals with major amendments such as official plan amendments. It deals with major development, such as the Red Hill Creek Expressway in Hamilton or the Vanier arterial expressway expansion in Ottawa-Carleton.

Typically, there are three types of parties who come before the Ontario Municipal Board in a given major hearing. First of all, these are municipalities. There will be a major municipality or several municipalities making submissions before the board, and of course municipalities are well funded. They have municipal planners, they retain consultants and they have legal counsel, and they are in a very professional mode when it comes to making submissions before the Ontario Municipal Board.

The second type of person or group that is typically before the Ontario Municipal Board in any given case is a developer or a group of developers who are proponents or who have a very significant financial interest in the determination of the board. Once again, they are well financed. They have legal counsel and they have experts who come

before the board because they know that the board will make its decision based on the evidence of experts.

1010

There is a third group that comes before the Ontario Municipal Board. It is usually an umbrella group of community associations and groups that are trying to represent a public interest of one type. Typically this party or group of parties before the Ontario Municipal Board does not have the means to retain expert legal counsel, does not have the financial means to hire the experts and therefore is not on a level playing field. They have a public interest to protect before these hearings. They are invited as citizens, active participants in the community, to come before the Ontario Municipal Board, yet they do not have the means to put themselves on an equal footing with the interests of the other parties, the municipality or the developers. So the main rationale is that we will have a level playing field created for citizens' groups coming before the Ontario Municipal Board.

I would like to refer to several quotes in support of my amendments. The first one I want to refer to is one from the member for Hamilton Mountain, the Minister of Financial Institutions. He debated this issue when it was last before this House and he supported my amendment in saying:

"The first important reason is that, as we move through a growing era of public concern and public participation in our regulatory processes, we have to begin to understand that, as government and as representatives of the people, we have a responsibility to fund the mechanisms that allow us to ascertain, to the best of our ability, what the real public desire and need is in any circumstance."

I also want to refer to a quote from the late Senator Eugene Forsey. There is no person, I think, better qualified to talk about the democratic process and citizen participation than the late senator who said, not too long before his death—something I think is very significant and profound:

"If things need changing, it is the people, not the politicians, who should change them. If they do not need changing, it is the people, not the politicians, who should decide not to change them." These are very profound words and I think very significant in the present context.

As we know, we have just had a legislative committee on the Constitution spend five weeks criss-crossing this province and we have also had the Spicer commission, which has given us a message that people in Canada and people in this province feel disfranchised. They feel that they do not have a say in major decisions that governments make on their behalf.

I am nearing the end of my time period. I will speak a little bit later, but I do want to say that by passing this amendment, this Legislature will be sending a message out that we want to enfranchise people, not disfranchise people.

Mr McLean: I welcome this opportunity to comment briefly on private member's Bill 39, An Act to amend the Intervenor Funding Project Act, 1988. The purpose of this bill is to add the Ontario Municipal Board as a board to which the act applies. The reference to a major financial

beneficiary in the definition of "proponent" is broadened to include other areas in addition to financial matters.

The Intervenor Funding Project Act established a three-year pilot project to investigate the use of intervenor funding to give public intervenors easier access to three regulatory tribunals. Those were the Environmental Assessment Board, the Ontario Energy Board and a joint board appointed under the Consolidated Hearings Act and composed of members from the environmental board and the Ontario Municipal Board.

I have always believed that intervenors contribute important evidence when matters come before the Ontario Municipal Board. Individuals know that the best way to become a part of the process is to organize or join a local citizens' group. This has several advantages. By teaming up with others who have similar concerns, people will have a unified and stronger influence on the decision-making process and people can also pool information and resources to share the work and the decision-making that participation entails.

However, participating in a hearing invariably entails some costs, and it could include money that individuals or community organizations simply do not have at their disposal. Typically, costs might include fees for lawyers, fees for expert assistance, travel and accommodation expenses and costs of materials used for presentations, such as photographs or graphics.

I personally believe in having equal resources available to individual intervenors or intervenor groups, provided they demonstrate they have a clear interest in the case, provided they demonstrate they have attempted to raise funds through other means such as community fund-raising and provided they demonstrate they have a genuine need for financial assistance. This would greatly enhance the quality of the hearings by giving these people the opportunity to raise and canvass important issues that otherwise might not have emerged.

I had an example in my own riding a few years ago with regard to intervenor funding, and it was really over a landfill site in Tiny township, site 41 as it was called. The municipality opposed it. The citizens from the community opposed it. It was a group of other municipalities that thought that site should be located in this municipality. In cases such as that I believe it is important that intervenor funding be made available to that municipality and to those citizens.

However, I do have some problems in some cases where individuals object to certain aspects of activity that takes place in a community who want to object for their own personal reasons. I think intervenor funding should be made available to those people and to local municipalities that have that important interest in principle.

There are some major concerns with regard to intervenor funding that I have had over the years. Many lawyers and consultants end up with all the money, and the fact is that a person with a lot of common sense could give the same evidence at no cost. There are people in society today who, when they see money coming from government, believe that there is no end to it. So I do have a major concern with regard to extending it to the municipal

board on those facts. However, I support the bill in principle. I think there are people, such as the case I had indicated, who do have a major, genuine interest.

I believe there should be a mechanism whereby intervenor funding would be a process that would be simple and easy, to determine whether people are going to qualify or not, not a lot of red tape before they would get their decision. As to the major concerns that I have, I have seen it with the Ontario Environment ministry. The Ministry of the Environment has been the major area where these activities have taken place. I think that it should be streamlined. As I said, I support this bill in principle, but the fact is that it has to be right and proper.

Hon Ms Carter: I want to give a different perspective on this. This situation is coming to a sunset conclusion, so that we are going to have to look at an overall replacement, not a piecemeal approach. This in fact is being done by the government, so this is what I want to say: We oppose this initiative because in the circumstances we are going to have to replace our whole approach to this issue. Therefore, we want to do it all at once, comprehensively, and that is how we want to approach it.

020

Mr Chiarelli: Mr Speaker, we were going to start using our 15-minute provision. As you are aware, I also have a two-minute wrap-up at the end.

The Deputy Speaker: That is fine: the member for Ottawa West.

Mr Chiarelli: I just wanted to say very briefly that yes, the minister is correct that there is a sunset provision in the legislation. It sunsets in, I believe, March 1992.

The Deputy Speaker: You are not entitled to respond to what she has said. You debate the issue.

Mr Chiarelli: I am debating the issue, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: That is right; okay.

Mr Chiarelli: I am debating the question whether or not it is appropriate to pass this amendment in view of the sunset provision.

The sunset provision indicates that the Intervenor Funding Project Act can be extended by order in council. There is nothing in the legislation itself which says that it should be reviewed. There is nothing the government has indicated at the present time which says that it is being reviewed. It would be my hope that the members on the government side, in view of the fact that they have voted in favour of this particular provision on two previous occasions, would vote in favour of it now and would also vote in favour of referring it to the standing committee on administration of justice, and that the Attorney General would refer the issue of sunset and reviewing the entire operation of the bill to the justice committee so that it can be looked at very comprehensively. In the meantime, there are significant groups in every part of Ontario which are looking for intervenor funding and which ought to be covered, as the Minister of the Environment said in 1988, under the Ontario Municipal Board auspices for this type of funding.

I would say that if the whip is out on the government side to vote against this particular amendment at this time, I think it would be very hypocritical indeed. In fact, the Minister of Health, the member for Ottawa Centre, would well know that the community in Ottawa-Carleton is very animated and very actively lobbying in favour of this amendment. I think it would be really negligent if the member for Ottawa Centre has not been able to convince her cabinet colleagues and her caucus colleagues to support this amendment, which has been supported actively by every umbrella citizens group in Ottawa-Carleton for the last three years.

I am going to give up the floor now so that my colleagues can have some additional time, but I do say to the members on the government side that I really believe they have an obligation, given their previous statements and given the present demand by public interest groups in the province, to support this amendment.

Mr Harnick: I am pleased to have the opportunity to provide some brief comments about Bill 39. This bill essentially is a bill that adds the Ontario Municipal Board as one of the boards for intervenor funding and in that way amends the Intervenor Funding Project Act, 1988.

I think that in principle, when we look at the fact of adding that board to the Intervenor Funding Project Act, I can support this piece of legislation. I can do that because the municipal board does many things which affect the day-to-day lives of the citizens in every community in this province. The municipal board has an effect on housing; it has an effect on municipal infrastructure; it has an effect on the environment; it has an effect on agricultural land; it has an effect on municipal development and on municipal taxation. All of these, and I am sure there are many other items as well, are subjects of Ontario Municipal Board decision-making.

It is important that individuals and ratepayers' groups, people who are not necessarily the most affluent members of a community or the most affluent advocates within a community, have an equal opportunity to present evidence before a municipal board with the use of experts with the proper legal help, because they have to convince essentially a panel of judges. They also have to have the opportunity to respond to the evidence presented by corporations that have the money—and by that I mean developers, corporations, private concerns—to appear with their experts, to appear with their lawyers and to pay with money that is a cost of doing business, which is not money that is taxable; it is deductible money for those corporations. Municipalities present evidence at the municipal board. They pay with taxpayers' money. What about individuals? That is why this bill is an important bill.

However, there is a caveat. There is a part of this bill that I have difficulty accepting, and that is the change in the definition of "proponent." The proposed amendment states that the proponent does not have to be a financial beneficiary, just a major beneficiary. That causes me some concern because it is the proponent who pays for the intervenor funding, and certainly when we are talking about a private concern as opposed to a municipal concern, if that private concern does not have a major financial interest,

why should it be paying the costs of the intervenors? That is certainly in my eyes a caveat and makes it somewhat difficult to support this bill totally, although I do support it in principle.

I would point out, and my time is short, that the Intervenor Funding Project Act is a good act. It provides the necessary protection in section 7 so that intervenors cannot be involved in a frivolous way within the proceedings of a board. I just want to quote what section 7 says so that people know what the eligibility is for intervenor funding. Section 7 of the act says, "Intervenor funding may be awarded only in relation to issues...which, in the opinion of the funding panel," which decides whether the funding will be given, "affects a significant segment of the public; and...which, in the opinion of the funding panel, affects the public interest and not just private interests." So people cannot come to this board and obtain intervenor funding for something that is frivolous.

In addition, section 7 sets out certain tests as to whether the funding should in fact be available, so you cannot just show up and out of the blue expect to obtain money without meeting, really, a seven-part test. I think the protections are there.

The idea of expanding this bill and the provisions for intervenor funding to the OMB are, in principle, something that I can personally accept. I do have the one caveat dealing with the definition of "proponent."

1030

Mrs Caplan: As I rise to participate in the debate today, I would like to speak in favour of the motion by the member for Ottawa West, which I believe is very timely, especially considering the comments by the Minister of Energy, who is here in the Legislature this morning.

I would remind the minister, and all colleagues in the House, that this is private members' hour. I was quite surprised to hear during this private members' hour debate that there was a government review of this very important matter of intervenor funding. We have not heard this from the government before. We do not know how this review is being conducted, where it is being conducted and what kind of public input there will be in this review. I believe her comments speak to why this Legislature should today be supportive of the proposal put forward by the member for Ottawa West, especially if the government is reviewing it, because by sending the member's bill to a committee of the Legislature, the government can have that review with full public debate, full public discussion in an open public forum instead of, as has been the habit of this NDP government, behind closed doors.

Today, for the very first time, we heard that there is a review that has been undertaken and I would urge the members of the NDP caucus who are here in the House today to remember the traditions of their caucus and of their party. They have supported the concept of intervenor funding. They have supported this type of legislation on numerous occasions. Their own Minister of the Environment, in recent times, has supported this legislation. I think it is quite outrageous. I am sure that the members of the NDP caucus are not going to stand for having a minister

stand in the House during private members' hour and dictate to all of them what their position will be, simply because the government is conducting an internal, private, hidden, secret review.

Surely private members' hour means more to the members of the NDP caucus and they will stand up today and support this legislation and this proposal by the member for Ottawa West, which they have supported time and time again in this House whenever there was an opportunity to debate and to discuss the issue of intervenor funding.

I can only say that the legislation and the merits of the legislation are clear. The Minister of Energy stood in her place and acknowledged the need for this kind of legislation and said the government supports the intent of the legislation, but it opposes this private member's initiative because of some secret government study that is taking place behind closed doors.

I say again to the minister, who is in the House today, and to her colleagues on the government benches that by standing in their places in support of this legislation during private members' hour, they will have an important opportunity to send a message to the cabinet and to the government. The message that they will be able to send is that private members' hour is an opportunity for every member of this House to express his or her point of view on important issues of the day, that they will have an opportunity during private members' hour not to be dictated to by the government and not to stand in their places and have to support simply the position that has been suggested to them by a minister in the House during private members' hour.

I expect that we will today see them stand in their places and support the bill of the member for Ottawa West and his fine proposal, and support sending it to committee so that it can have the kind of full public discussion and full public debate and scrutiny that it deserves.

Mr Arnott: I would like to congratulate the member for Ottawa West on his proposal of Bill 39, An Act to amend the Intervenor Funding Project Act, 1988. I have some limited reservations about the concept of intervenor funding. However, I know that in the past the New Democrats have been very supportive of it and I look forward to seeing the recorded vote.

I know that public interest groups should have an opportunity to apply to become intervenors and receive intervenor funding from time to time, since the principle has been established. I would like to speak about some interesting implications that this bill has for my riding.

Puslinch township in the south of my riding has been involved in a lengthy OMB hearing which finished a few months ago. It took a number of months. The township took the position that it had to defend its official plan against aggregate mining policies that were coming forward. There were a number of applications for aggregate mining in the township that were, in the opinion of the township, running counter to what it wanted to do.

The township has been faced with a legal bill of \$243,662.30. For a small municipality, that is a very significant sum of money.

They have recently asked me to assist them in attempting to receive a meeting with the Premier, and I am certainly in the process of doing that. I hope the Premier will in fact meet with the township to discuss his past interest in intervenor funding and his past support of the concept so that we can see if the provincial government will be interested in assisting the township in this way.

Mr McGuinty: It is my pleasure to rise in support of this bill, and it is a particular pleasure because it addresses an ideal I think we all hold, and that is equal access to justice.

I think we should acknowledge that there is at present in Ontario no equal access to justice. There are still many cases where access can only be had at expense, and sometimes at great expense. As a practising lawyer, it became all too familiar to me when I was involved with cases where people with legitimate complaints, cases where people's rights had been breached, simply could not afford to seek legal redress or recourse.

The legal aid system goes some way in addressing or remedying that particular situation, but it only addresses lower-income groups. As a general rule, it is restricted to addressing matters which arise before our courts, and in spite of legal aid, justice is still in many cases realistically denied to those people for whom it would be too expensive, particularly those in the middle-income groups. Legal aid does not address the matter of intervenor funding before administrative tribunals and the bill introduced by the former government attempted to remedy that.

I think it is important to remember that people's rights are affected by administrative tribunals in a very real way, as well. In order to have their rights addressed, in order to make presentations before tribunals, it again costs money and sometimes it costs a great deal of money.

Another feature of some of our administrative tribunals is that they often entertain matters of dispute between parties, as the member for Ottawa West mentioned, of unequal strength, and by "strength," again, we are often referring to financial strength. Financial ability often, unfortunately, enables one to make better preparation in terms of a hearing, to present better evidence, to pay for better expert witnesses.

The Intervenor Funding Project Act went some way in addressing the problem; however, it restricted the remedies to hearings before the Environmental Assessment Board, the Ontario Energy Board and the joint board. The member for Ottawa West's bill addresses this deficiency to some extent by broadening the scope of the intervenor funding to allow it to apply to hearings before the Ontario Municipal Board. The Ontario Municipal Board is notorious for holding hearings in many cases where parties of unequal strength often come to lock horns, and again, we are talking here about one party having much greater financial strength than another party.

I think we should take advantage of the trial period. We should seize the opportunity to inject another element. I do not think any of us should be heard to say that we are going to put a particular group's rights on hold, and that is often the case.

We had a recent case in Ottawa where a legal bill to the tune of \$80,000 was presented to Ottawa's New Edinburgh Community Alliance Inc, which presented its case before the Ontario Municipal Board, and it had, because of existing inequalities, no recourse to intervenor funding.

1040

I think as well that we should recognize the presentation prepared in a brief by the Canadian Environmental Law Association, a brief presented to the standing committee on government agencies regarding the Ontario Municipal Board. It was prepared by Richard Lindgren, counsel, and it is dated 7 February 1991. It is a very thoughtful, lengthy brief. I want to quote from it. It indicates at one point:

"Because of its diverse legislative authority, the Ontario Municipal Board plays an important role in shaping the character of Ontario's urban and rural environment. It is noteworthy that there are very limited appeal rights with respect to OMB decisions, and hence the board often functions as the final arbiter of disputes involving matters of considerable public interest.

"The virtual finality of OMB decisions makes it imperative that all relevant evidence, information and opinions are presented fully and effectively before the board. However, there has been increasing concern among environmental law association counsel that certain OMB practices and procedures are undermining public participatory rights and public confidence in the OMB hearing process, especially where environmental issues are involved. In particular, the Canadian Environmental Law Association concerns focus primarily on the following matters:"

It then outlined a list, and at the top of the list, it makes reference to the lack of intervenor funding in OMB cases. I want to quote from it just a bit more. It goes on to provide:

"In a 1988 submission to the Attorney General, the Canadian Environmental Law Association argued that the intervenor funding legislation should apply to the OMB. It is noteworthy that the Honourable Ruth Grier, Minister of the Environment, also supported the extension of the intervenor funding legislation to the OMB. In 1991, CELA's view remains unchanged, and we submit that the Ontario Municipal Board must be brought within the ambit of intervenor funding legislation for a number of reasons."

It then goes on to provide those reasons in a very thoughtful, methodical and emphatic way, many of which have been outlined today by the member for Ottawa West.

I want to second the member for Ottawa West's statements when he made reference to Ottawa-Carleton's hope and support for this bill. I have been approached by a couple of community groups in my riding that are expressing concerns with respect to presenting their cases and the financial problems they are going to encounter for matters appearing before the Ontario Municipal Board.

This is an opportunity, again, that I feel we should seize. We have a grand experiment in motion at the present time. I think we have nothing to lose by injecting another element, which in fact goes a long way towards redressing a problem that presents to a great number of people, community groups in particular, who are having difficulty presenting their cases before the Ontario Municipal Board.

Finally, I would like to re-emphasize that what we are talking about here in a very fundamental way is addressing the ideal that we hold, and that is of attaining a particular goal of equal access to justice. This goes a long way towards ensuring that, with respect to matters before the Ontario Municipal Board, the parties will be enabled to present their cases on an equal footing, regardless of their financial capability, regardless of their particular expertise, because they will be able particularly to retain counsel, experts, and proceed on an equal footing.

Mr B. Murdoch: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to talk on this bill. I am opposed to this bill on the ground that I think there is too much intervenor funding now. To give intervenor funding to fight the OMB right now would be a mistake. The OMB is full of cases it cannot even get to, and with more intervenor funding we would have more people going there and at this time it would just be ridiculous for it to happen.

Also, it is piecemeal. I do not think we need to be patching on; we need something to straighten the whole mess out. Intervenor funding has been around for a little while, but not with the OMB, and at this time I do not think it should be there.

We do elect municipalities, and unfortunately what seems to be happening in Ontario is that people are getting little groups all the time and forming their own opinions, rather than listening to the municipalities they elect. If they have problems with some of the decisions municipalities make, the time to show that is in elections. They get the chance then to tell people they are not happy with it. But if we start intervenor funding for the OMB, we are going to have people complaining about porches and just down to anything they do not like.

One of my colleagues talked about frivolous objections. Well, there do not seem to be any frivolous objections any more in this House. The OMB seems to accept every objection and it goes to the OMB and this why it is in problems. As I say, it is backed up for over a year now to get a case on and, if we start intervenor funding, there will be problems.

Mr Silipo: I rise to speak briefly in support of this bill. I think it has probably become known that it is my attitude in private members' hour to start off by basically being supportive of initiatives that come forward from individual members unless there is something in the proposed law or resolution that I find completely unacceptable.

In this case, while I may share some of the reservations that have been mentioned by other speakers, I find that the concept that is in the bill of expanding the application of the Intervenor Funding Project Act to include the OMB is a worthwhile pursuit. Any step forward made to try to expand, in effect, the access to tribunals and indeed through that the principle of access to justice I think is worth while supporting.

There may be very good reasons why there are some problems with simply taking this particular step without taking others, but it seems to me that is the kind of thing that can be worked out through the committee process if

and when this bill gets there. If there are other considerations in terms of time lines, etc, that come into play, they can also be considered, as well as the issue of possibly expanding the scope of the bill and looking at how it fits into other pieces of legislation.

For that reason I will be supporting this bill, because I think debate at this point of the proceedings is in fact debate on the principle of a bill, and certainly the principle that is espoused in this bill is one I can support.

I do want to say—and this will really be an expansion of something I have said in the past in referring to the comments from the member for Oriole, and I regret she is not in the House at the moment. It is incumbent on all of us, if we really are trying to and are serious about making this session every Thursday morning as one that ought to cross partisan divisions, that we be careful in the way in which we try to read what may be coming out of either ministers or other members on the government side in terms of their comments.

Certainly, I do not think there is anyone on the government side dictating to any of the members of the government side how to vote or what to do on issues like this. We obviously have our discussions about private members' bills, as we may do about other issues, but we come to this House on these Thursday mornings very clearly able and willing to stand up and vote as we see befits each and every one of the proposals that come before us. When we start to try to read any more than that into the positions that might be coming forward from individuals on this side of the House, I think it certainly does not assist in the building of the kind of relations that need to be built, particularly around private members' bills and resolutions, but hopefully on other ventures as well.

I reiterate that, and I will be happy to stand up and continue to make that point throughout the proceedings as private members' bills come forward, although I hope that as time goes on it will be less and less necessary to do that and that more and more of our time can be devoted to looking really in a critical way and in a constructive way at the proposals that come forward. Just to sum up, I will be supporting this bill because I think it expands the concept of access to justice for groups beyond what exists now in law, and for that reason is something worthy of support.

1050

Mr Chiarelli: I want to thank the member for Dovercourt for his support and for putting the issue in context of the private members' hour.

I want to speak most directly to the people of Ottawa-Carleton today because the people of Ottawa-Carleton really support this legislation and have done so for the past three years.

Last week I sent a letter, personally delivered, to the Minister of Health, the member for Ottawa Centre, asking for her support. I was very disappointed to see the first speaker for the government stand up today, being a minister, being opposed to it, and what appears to be a majority on the government side nodding their heads in agreement opposing this.

I say to the member for Ottawa Centre that she is going to have to answer to Russ Barton from the Federation of Community Associations in Ottawa-Carleton; she is going to have to answer to Barry Wellar from the Carlingwood Action Group; she is going to have to answer to Bob Fortin from the Civic Forum; she is going to have to answer to Hillary Pearson from the New Edinburgh Community Alliance; she is going to have to answer to Mark Deuhez from Heritage Ottawa.

The overwhelming majority of people in Ottawa-Carleton support this legislation, have communicated their support for this legislation. I am very disappointed to see that the minister from eastern Ontario has not been able to convince her caucus colleagues, in fact her cabinet colleagues, to support this amendment. There is tremendous support in Ottawa-Carleton for it and there will be a tremendous amount of disappointment.

In fact, I really believe that if the NDP members vote against this bill today they are going to be hanging out to dry the member for Ottawa Centre, who ought to be here supporting it. Not only will they be hanging out the member for Ottawa Centre to dry, they will be hanging out all those sincere, honest people in community public interest groups who will continue not to have a level playing field.

ELECTRICAL WIRING SYSTEMS ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR LES INSTALLATIONS ÉLECTRIQUES

Mr Jordan moved second reading of Bill 67, An Act respecting Electrical Wiring Systems.

M. Jordan propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 67, Loi concernant les installations électriques.

Mr Jordan: I thank you, Mr Speaker, and the members of this Legislature for the opportunity this morning to speak in support of Bill 67.

The two main points of this bill are public safety and economics for the people of Ontario. I would like first to talk about safety. As many of us are aware, electricity is one of the most efficient, safe, clean and environmentally friendly of all energies used in Ontario. It is extremely versatile and has been recognized as the engine and power of the economy of this province. This energy can also be very dangerous, even deadly, if the installation or the handling of it is not properly understood.

Over the years, Ontario Hydro has taken the responsibility of providing the required inspection staff capable of overseeing the installation of wiring and connection of equipment in the province. The ongoing problem has been to properly identify the person responsible for the actual wiring and connection of the equipment. The person identified to the Ontario Hydro inspection staff does not necessarily have to be the person doing the work.

This bill would require the trade licence number of the person accepting responsibility to be placed on the application for inspection. This procedure would allow a preliminary check on a proposed installation by a qualified tradesman. I want to clarify that this does not prevent an individual from doing minor wiring at his residence or cottage or whatever, but it does require that he has discussed his plan with a professional tradesman to the extent

that that person is agreeable that he may use his number on his application for inspection. This in turn gives the inspector someone he can follow up with; if there should be defects or whatever in the wiring, the inspector then has a contact who understands the code book and understands the message that comes out itemizing the defects on that particular job.

Under the present setup, those defects go to an individual—it could be a grandfather, a grandson—and that person does not know the code book or does not understand the defects that are being presented. So in the interest of safety what I am attempting to do with this bill is encourage people to consult with a professional tradesman before even purchasing the material, because as members know today, the technology changes, and the difference in the types of equipment available is ongoing.

Ontario Hydro makes an effort through its inspection staff, with evening seminars in conjunction with the Ontario Electrical League, to keep the tradesmen and the profession up to date on the Ontario electrical code. But to try to keep every individual up to date is impossible, so what happens is that an individual applying for a wiring permit sometimes, and I have had the occasion to witness this myself, has invested a lot of money in equipment that is outdated and is no longer acceptable by the code. It could be the type of insulation on the wire; it could be the type of terminal box that is to be used.

At this time I think it would be well to mention that the new 1990 Ontario Electrical Code, revised, has just been issued and is effective as of 4 March 1991. Applications were still accepted under the old revision until Monday of this week, so I think it is timely that we take a serious look at this at this time.

Consultation with a professional would allow a check on the equipment. It would give assurance to the inspection department that somebody, as I say, who understands the trade has in fact been consulted. Members could imagine the poor public relations that tend to be developed by the inspector arriving at a residence, at a recreation room or at a cottage, and finding that equipment was bought on sale and the person marketing that equipment is under no real responsibility to advise that it is no longer approved, or may not even know that. So when the inspector advises the customer that he is sorry that this equipment is no longer approved and that it has to be removed, there is a tremendous cost involved to the customer. There is an administration cost and a labour cost involved to Ontario Hydro and each individual in the province of Ontario, because that cost is reflected in the rate per kilowatt hour that we pay on our Hydro bill.

1100

What is happening at the present time is that when the inspector goes out he actually becomes part of a skills development scene where he is in fact training an individual to be familiar with the code book, to be familiar with equipment, and because of his training with people, he tries to do that in such a way that there are no hard feelings against him or the Ontario Hydro utility.

This may be very fine, but the cost of inspection is increasing every day. Ontario Hydro is asking for a

considerable increase in rates, and I see this as a very real opportunity to turn the skills development part over to a professional tradesman who the individual is free to consult with at any time and use that number, or if he is a tradesman himself, use that number on the application for inspection.

It has another administration saving in that the office people have a chance to have a direct contact through that number to that tradesman when corrections are required.

If you think of residences with computers and the different types of appliances that are now being used in homes, I believe if you think about that for a little, you can understand the need of professional training. I do not mean when you are replacing a light fixture. Replacement of that type of equipment does not require an inspection per se, but when you are doing service work, a service entrance—for instance, in the new revisions, it used to be in a large residence you could come directly in to, say, a 400-amp splitter box and take six feeders off that box to feed different areas of that large home. That is now not acceptable, as of Monday of this week. You must have a main switch prior to that equipment for safety reasons so that when you pull that switch, whether it is the fireman or whoever it is, you know that everything in that house is electrically dead.

These are the kinds of things that an individual, without consultation with a professional in the trade, can spend a lot of money on and have a lot of hard feelings about and, in my thinking, could easily become part of the group by consulting with either his supplier of electrical equipment or some friend of his in the electrical business who does have a licence and is willing to consult on the job.

I would hope that the people here today would try to understand the seriousness of this relative to safety.

Mr Offer: Let me say what a great pleasure it is for me to join in on the debate this morning on this piece of legislation put forward by the honourable member for Lanark-Renfrew.

At the outset let me indicate that it had been our intention that both myself and the member for Timiskaming would also be speaking. Unfortunately, the member has been called away on urgent constituency business. We recognize that difficulty, that the member is not going to be able to speak on this particular issue as a result of a matter of urgency in his riding. However, it presents to me, of course, the opportunity to speak at some greater length on this particular piece of legislation, and for that certainly we look forward to it.

The piece of legislation, let me say at the outset, is one which I agree with in principle, because it is a piece of legislation which has as its principle, I believe, the issue of safety, and I believe this particular piece of legislation is timely in its introduction and surely timely as to the debate taking place.

Why I say that is because it was just last March, 4 March of this year, that the 1990 Electrical Safety Code became effective, and in that code there were a variety of changes, a variety of amendments. I think that, although I believe there to be something in the area of 400 changes—it is impossible for me to speak to those at this time—it does bring to the fore the issue of not only the complexity

of electrical installation, but also that its installation is one which is not a static type of profession. It is one which is constantly changing.

I have had occasion to pick up an article by Roy Hicks, the chief electrical inspector of Ontario Hydro, and he has spoken at some length as to some of those changes. For instance: "Every consumer's service must now have a single disconnect switch. The Ontario relaxation that allowed up to six subdivisions on a residential service without a single main switch has been eliminated. This means there will be one and only one switch to disconnect the power in a dwelling unit when service work is being done or in the event of a fire."

A second change is that: "Consumer service conductors enter a dwelling unit above grade where practicable. This eliminates the chance for water to enter service panels and switches due to leaks in the service conduit.

"Also at the service panel, there is a new requirement that main switches and panelboards in rooms or areas of combustible construction be mounted such that the back surface is not in contact with or within 50 millimetres (two inches) through air of a material having a flame spread rating greater than 25."

These are but three changes. If time permits, I might have occasion to run through a few others, but it does speak to the necessity in the area of installation of people to be well acquainted with not only what the code is, but also to be acquainted with the fact that the code is constantly changing and that it is an obligation, a responsibility to try to keep abreast of these changes.

This is a piece of legislation which is not just applicable to the commercial sector. I think that is an important aspect to bring forward. I think that many people, when taking a look at legislation such as this or in fact the standards code, seem to immediately draw a connection between that and the commercial sector and feel that much of the work is done by accredited electricians. In fact, a great deal of work is done within our own homes: people doing rec rooms, a variety of additions to their homes. The use of computers in homes may necessitate change. Fax machines are now becoming almost commonplace, although I do not state that as a fact; I just state that it is not as surprising any longer when someone does have a fax machine, a computer setup with graphics, with printers and a variety of other electrical appliances in their homes today which were not in their homes 5 or 10 years ago, or even contemplated. It is important, if there is going to be a change in the electrical characteristics of a home, that that work be done by someone who is qualified.

I recognize that a great deal of the work is done by home owners. That is their right. That is in many ways a recreation. I believe that this bill speaks to the fact and to the issue that it is not against the home owner or the relative performing the work, but rather that the work, which is of an increasingly complex nature, be at least supervised by an individual who is accredited, who is qualified. That is what this particular piece of legislation speaks to, and because the work under this piece of legislation is one which suggests guidance, advice or in fact hands-on assistance in a

very dangerous and complicated matter, it is one which I certainly can support in principle.

1110

I move back to some of the changes to the code. I think that we should preface everything by recognizing that in the code there have been 450 changes to the electrical safety code, about 40 deletions and indeed 30 appendix B changes. This is important to just recognize as having happened, and when we keep in mind these changes and additions and deletions, on one hand, and on the other hand we recognize that there are a great many electrical pieces of work being done in homes, we want to try to marry the two, to make certain that that work is being done, supervised or assisted by accredited electricians. I do not see anything wrong, I do not see anything surprising in that type of principle, in that type of direction, and it is for that that I support the piece of legislation.

A few other changes, just to once more bring home the fact of these types of matters: There has been an additional requirement that will affect the bundling of non-metallic sheathed cables. Some here might say, "Well, my goodness, why is this person becoming so complex in this area?" In fact, this really talks to the concern of the overheating of a cable when they are bundled together. I do not have to speak in this Legislature as to the tragic consequences of overheating, what that can potentially cause and the tragedies that can result from it. These are of course matters which we, as all members of the Legislature, must keep in mind and must, I believe, have as our responsibility and obligation to address them as best we can, and this particular piece of legislation I believe does.

Now, I speak in support of the principle, but I do wish to add certain concerns, and I do not want everyone to say: "Oh, here it comes. The member is now going to really rip apart the piece of legislation." No, that is not the case. I do speak about some concerns as I was taking a look at some of the readings over the bill and certainly some of the articles which have been written about the changes.

We have to recognize, in a sense, the workability of the bill. When we say that work will be supervised—I believe, if memory serves me correctly, that was what the member for Lanark-Renfrew referred to—sponsored by accredited electricians, it sounds good, it sounds right, but I think we have to take a look at what is the liability of the sponsoring electrician. What are the questions that electrician will ask in terms of his or her sponsorship? What will be the case of an electrician stating to a home owner, "If this is the work you are going to do, this is how it should proceed," and then be signing his name to it, in essence, which may, if there has not been that hands-on help, result in some problem, result in some deficiency which Ontario Hydro may have uncovered, result in some damage or destruction?

The electrician will say, "Well, I need some protection in a certain liability sense." It is not, I believe, enough to say that we are just going to have an accredited electrician sponsor a particular piece of work without going further and saying that electrician is most likely going to be asking questions as to the liability that he or she is potentially holding himself or herself out to.

It may very well be that in order to get an electrician to so sponsor any particular work, which in a home can be very complex—and I have gone through some of the changes in the code which make that quite evident—he may say, "Listen, I am not going to put my name or number to that particular piece of work without having to be there." That, of course, talks to whether in fact we are potentially creating a barrier, even for the most right reasons, to people doing the work by themselves in their home, and then there are all the costs that may arise, the cost of the work and items of this nature.

I say that this piece of legislation, once more, is one which I certainly agree with in principle. I think it has as its fundamental basis safety. I believe that to be an issue which all members of this Legislature should be in support of. I think it also reflects that the code has just recently gone under massive change, that it is a code which is constantly changing, that we have a responsibility to make certain that the work that is being done, not just in the commercial sector but also in the private, the residential sector, is one which is safe, is one which complies and it is one which has some sort of an overseeing mechanism.

It is a bill which I believe does deserve further scrutiny, certainly on the whole issue of liability, certainly on the issue as to how we can marry or meld the person in the home doing the work with the accredited electrician overseeing the work.

I applaud the member for bringing forward this particular piece of legislation. I look forward to continued debate on this matter, and I certainly look forward to more debate.

Mr McLean: I am extremely pleased to have this opportunity to provide a few comments on private member's Bill 67, An Act respecting Electrical Wiring Systems, and I congratulate my colleague the member for Lanark-Renfrew for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House.

As we all know, "This bill would prohibit persons from performing work on electrical wiring system unless they hold a certificate of qualification as an electrician or perform the work under the supervision of someone who does hold a certificate," which means they can go ahead and do the work, provided that it is being done under the jurisdiction of somebody who is qualified and holds a certificate.

As well, "Persons who apply to Ontario Hydro for an inspection of work performed on an electrical wiring system would be required to indicate the certificate of qualification number of the person who carried out or supervised the work on the application, and would not be entitled to an inspection unless this was done."

1120

This bill is pure common sense. It is just one more example of the commonsense ideas, proposals and policies that are being generated by the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr Mills: What has that got to do with Bill 67?

Mr McLean: I want to make sure the members know it. The commonsense focus of this bill is on safety and economics for the people of this province. It is my

understanding that if this bill is passed, and I expect it will be, it will mean the people of this province will be saving electrical inspection and equipment costs by almost one third. That is what I call good economics.

There is no doubt in my mind that all of us in this House should support legislation that will save the people of Ontario money. People are fed up with a government that keeps coming to them for more. When the previous Liberal government ran out of money, it taxed the people, it borrowed, it ran a deficit. Now I am worried that the current NDP government is going to pick up where the Liberals left off.

The taxpayers of Ontario know that taxes are way out of whack with their ability to pay, and that worries them a great deal. We are now the highest-taxed jurisdiction, not just in Canada but in all of North America. This worries people, especially when we are in a time of recession, because it is choking the economy and it is killing jobs. It is feeling demands for even more government spending, and more government spending means only one thing: higher taxes. For every dollar earned in Ontario today people are paying 51 cents in taxes. In other words, the government is getting more of the worker's paycheque than he or she does. Taxpayers, families, students, the sick and the poor and the elderly, all of us are now paying the price for the excess of government.

The Premier's recent decision to effectively allow Ontario's spending and deficit to skyrocket even more, plus hike taxes, is a receipt for disaster.

When we have a bill before us, a commonsense bill that would reduce in some cases up to a third, as I have indicated, of the cost of installing electrical safety and wiring, I think it is important that we do take a look and we should be developing methods for saving them money. That is why I support this bill. It will save money while providing an element of safety. That is why this bill is so important here today.

This bill does not prevent individuals from installing wiring in the new home that they are building with the help of a friend, but it does mean they have to have a number of a qualified electricians. I see no hardship in that. Because of the detriment to society in the fires in the homes we could have, its safety is number one.

This bill is especially important because of the new electrical safety code that came into effect on 4 March 1991. This has made many changes. Indications are there are about 450 changes in the new Electrical Safety Code. So when we look at how it affects residential installations, I think it is important, and this bill is important today to allow this thing to happen.

With regard to installation, "Also at the service panel, there is a new requirement that main switches and panelboards in rooms or areas of combustible construction be mounted such that the back surface is not in contact with or within 50 millimetres (2 inches) through air of a material having a flame spread..." It goes on and gives some of the new criteria, and I think the electricians who are allowing people to do their own wiring should make them fully aware of what these new qualifications are.

It is really a very simple bill. The bill is not long. It just is simple enough that I believe the Minister of Energy would probably see fit to support it and the members of her government I am sure would see fit to support it. I think really it just makes sure that people who are qualified have the jurisdiction over those who are doing their own wiring in their own homes.

Mr B. Murdoch: It's just common sense.

Mr McLean: It is a plain commonsense bill and it is a bill that is going to save the taxpayers some money. There are provisions in the bill that anybody who contravenes is guilty of an offence and will be charged. When we have these types of bills in the Legislature in private members' hour on Thursday mornings, I think the government would do well to listen to some of the points that are put across by the members in the opposition. I think the member for Durham East would be supporting this bill fully with his knowledge of what the taxpayers' cost has been. As an individual who worked for the Ministry of Revenue, I know he would feel that saving the taxpayer money would be one of the main and most important things on his mind.

Mr Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to say a few words. I am certainly supporting this bill and urge every member here to do so.

Hon Ms Carter: I do appreciate what the member for Lanark-Renfrew is trying to do with this bill, though I want to qualify his remarks on electricity being such a clean, safe and environmentally friendly fuel. Certainly at the point of use it is, but just how much so depends on how it is generated.

The member for Lanark-Renfrew is trying to save Ontario Hydro and through it consumers some money and also to encourage safety. That is appreciated, and these are some of the points that people have raised about this bill. There is also the question of people who may be out at the cottage and it is difficult to get the Hydro inspector in and so on. All that is well taken. The problem I have is that if this bill were put into practice, the results would not be quite what are being foreseen here. I would like to suggest some of the problems that might arise.

First of all, Canadians are do-it-yourselfers and I think on the whole that is a good characteristic. People like to be independent, they like to feel they know something about practical matters and that they can do things themselves in their homes and their cottages and wherever. I believe at the present time about 50% of electrical work that is done by people on their own is not inspected by Hydro because those people do not notify Hydro, and that, of course, is a problem and a safety hazard.

I am afraid that if this legislation comes in so that all wiring has to be done either by a qualified electrician or under the supervision of one, a few people might say, "All right, we won't do what we would have done before, we'll get somebody in," but others might just say, "This is too much of a nuisance, we'll just go ahead and do it anyway." We are going to increase the proportion of jobs of this kind that are done unsafely, inefficiently and are then not inspected because people who have done this work without supervision are then going to be unable to call on an

inspector to come and check it out. This opens up all kinds of dangerous possibilities.

1130

At the present time Ontario Hydro does interact, as was suggested, fairly heavily with people who are doing work on their own. They make sure people have the information they need to do the job right. This takes time. They inspect very carefully, and if they find mistakes, they give instructions for correcting them and then they come back again and reinspect. Of course, it is publicly paid time. It does mean spending ratepayers' dollars, but as I said, there is another side to this issue.

If we do not help people in this way to do these things, what are we going to do? Are we going to put draconian restrictions that tell people they cannot do things in their own homes? How would we even enforce restrictions of that kind? How are we going to prevent innocent people from being unnecessarily endangered by unsafe wiring? The dangers that are inherent in this kind of situation are very drastic dangers, dangers of electrocution, of buildings catching fire and burning and so on. We cannot run the risk of this kind of incident being increased.

This kind of restriction has been introduced in other jurisdictions. It has happened in some provinces that there have been cases of electricians filing papers saying that work was done by them or was supervised by them when this was not the case and they have collected fees from do-it-yourselfers for signing off and allowing their name or number to be used. I am not suggesting this would happen in Ontario. I have trust in the electricians of this province, but it is a disquieting precedent and it is something that should be taken into account when we are thinking about this issue.

Also, there could be some other undesirable spinoffs. The member for Lanark-Renfrew was saying that with things as they are, people buying unsuitable equipment, maybe they are not sufficiently up to date on what is required and they waste their money, and of course that is to be deplored. But if his ideas were implemented, it is possible that we should have to require the removal of all electrical materials from publicly accessible retail outlets. The public would be denied the freedom of buying this equipment, and thus business would be impacted and a significant source of income would be denied to the commercial hardware market. So this financial argument can work two ways round. There would also be a temptation for people to buy equipment of this kind across the border or overseas and bring it back into Ontario, and we do not want to encourage cross-border shopping.

On balance, I feel that this bill should be opposed. I am not issuing any draconian orders to anybody. I do feel it encourages evasion of the law and would, on balance, lead to less safety, not more. I would also like to make it clear that Ontario Hydro itself opposes this initiative. In particular the manager of electrical inspection for Hydro is not in favour of this idea being implemented.

Mr Arnott: I am very pleased to rise in support of Bill 67, An Act respecting Electrical Wiring Systems. I know that my good friend the member for Lanark-Renfrew has a

great deal of knowledge and expertise in this area. He has worked for Ontario Hydro for I think 39 years. I know him to be very sincere in this initiative and I know he has very vast knowledge in this area.

While I myself have done a considerable deal of research to be prepared to speak on this, I still find it somewhat complex and I am not 100% sure I understand the technical aspects of it, but as my colleague the member for Simcoe East indicated, I feel this is a commonsense principle that we should look at very closely. The member for Mississauga North has also supported it for a number of reasons, and I feel this initiative merits our support and our consideration.

There is a public safety issue involved, as the member for Lanark-Renfrew has indicated, that has to be looked at. If electricity is not handled properly and safely, there is considerable risk. I think if we ensure that electrical equipment installation is done within the supervision of a qualified tradesman, we enhance safety aspects considerably, and I think that we have to look towards that part of the argument.

Simply for an individual to request the trade licence number of a qualified technician to put on the application for inspection I feel does not in any way hinder the individual's efforts to do the work in his own home. I do not think that is hindered at all and I am quite surprised by the minister's suggestion that safety would in fact be minimized and be somewhat less in effect if this bill were to come into law.

The minister indicates there would be more abuses rather than fewer. I am quite surprised at that. I do not feel that is the case. I think that most people do have an understanding that electricity is something you deal with quite carefully and that you would want a Hydro inspector to come in, irrespective of how the work has been done. I certainly do not agree in that respect.

I understand that Ontario Hydro does work co-operatively to attempt to have people very well aware of how the electricity should be handled and how the work should be done within our own homes, but as the member for Lanark-Renfrew has indicated as well as the member for Mississauga North, there have been 450 changes to the code just in the past month or so. I do not know how often those are reviewed but those are a significant number of changes. I think it is very difficult for the Ministry of Energy or Ontario Hydro to attempt to apprise individuals of the changes. I just do not see that as being a point that should sway our opinion on this act. It has not swayed my opinion.

I know this has affected my family recently. My wife's first cousin was very, very seriously burned two weeks ago while he was working in a manhole. It certainly underlines the realization that we have to treat electricity with care, in my own feeling, and I think this bill and this initiative by the member for Lanark-Renfrew does in fact do that.

I indicate that I will be supporting it fully and I hope we receive support from members of all parties. I hope the indication from the Minister of Energy will not bias anyone's opinion as to this. I hope they look at our arguments carefully and closely and consider all points that

have been made in this debate before they render their judgement on this bill.

Mr Huget: I would like to thank the member for Lanark-Renfrew for his contribution this morning in bringing forward Bill 67. As the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy, I have found that the member is well respected in the ministry for his very constructive role as opposition critic on all energy issues.

Unfortunately, today I must also argue against his bill. While Bill 67 is an effort to find a constructive solution to a genuine concern, it creates more problems than it solves and I must encourage my colleagues in the House to oppose it.

Bill 67 effectively calls for an end to the home handyperson's work on wiring. With the host of do-it-yourself books on the shelves and the long tradition of renovated houses and cottages in the real estate market, it is not hard to see why so many people want to do it themselves when it comes to wiring, the same as when it comes to drywalling, painting and installing carpet.

1140

But there is a difference, and it is an important difference here. Faulty wiring is a serious danger to the public. Because of this danger the province of Ontario has strict regulations on wiring, and requires that the wiring be inspected by professionals from Hydro. Without these inspections, there would be serious risk of mistakes in wiring going undetected until disaster struck. Bill 67 would put an end to all that. Times being what they are and full-time professional help costing what it does, some home handypeople would still choose to do their wiring themselves, but under Bill 67 they could not do it legally and they could not get it inspected. The risks involved in that are, I think, too big for us to take.

I want to raise another issue here. What would it take to enforce Bill 67 if it were passed? I think we need to think very clearly about that. It would be illegal for the ordinary man or woman to do wiring. To make that stick, you would have to take electrical materials off the shelf at regular hardware stores, or you would be inviting illegal activity. The retail hardware trade in this province would take that very hard. Since no electrical supplies would be available off the shelf, even legitimate home do-it-yourself programs and simple maintenance jobs, like changing a light switch or fixing a plug, would be interrupted.

Since other jurisdictions have shown that people still do some of the electrical work despite restrictions of this kind, we could expect people to go out of their way to get materials they need anyway. Where would they get them? In communities like mine they would get them in the United States. Since Bill 67 would have to be followed by measures to restrict their right to buy electrical materials, people would be motivated to engage in cross-border shopping to get what they need.

I do not think I have to go on much longer to convince the House that Bill 67, for its good intentions—and I admit they are very good intentions—creates more problems than it solves and is not a bill that should receive second reading in this House.

Mr B. Murdoch: I am glad to stand in support of this bill. What we have just heard was a lot of rhetoric, and I think some people may say hooey. I would like to say that this bill does not do all those things we just heard about. It does allow the homeowner to do his own work. All he has to do is get a number. If some people would read the bill and understand it, we would not have all this rhetoric and trying to persuade people that the bill is not a good one.

I think that if some of these people would go to some fires that have happened in rural areas where some people have done their own wiring, and if they had to go as some of the volunteer firemen have to do and fight these fires that electrical mistakes have caused, then they would understand this whole bill. It just shows that if you do not read the whole bill, you do not understand it. I think this is what has happened.

I would just like to say that I support this bill wholly, and hope that the people here can use common sense for a change, which has been lacking in this House for the last few years. So hopefully members can see that and vote for this bill.

Mrs Haslam: I did have a house fire. It was not from electrical wiring, but—

Mr Owens: It was the plumbing.

Mrs Haslam: Yes, plumbing. I know how bad a house fire can be, Bill, and I am sorry—

The Deputy Speaker: Please address the chair.

Mrs Haslam: I know how difficult a house fire can be and I do take the member's remarks to heart. However, I agree with the previous two speakers on this side that there are some problems with this particular bill. One of the things I have a problem with is people who do minor repairs. If I want to put a dimmer switch in, then I put a dimmer switch in. This will alleviate even—it goes into a minor—

Mr Carr: Can you come to my house? I need one of them.

Mrs Haslam: The member needs one of those?

Mr Villeneuve: Some of us don't.

Mrs Haslam: I am being provoked, Mr Speaker.

I believe that the bill will promote and not reduce illegal activity, and this has been said before, because when you now make it illegal for any type of work to be done, you are getting that person who does that little bit of work in his house—it is totally illegal now. I feel that a lot of times it is easier for him to get an electrician to come in to do a little bit of work and have it inspected, but when you require him to have an electrician come in and do all of it, he is going to do it himself, and then he is not going to get it inspected. I think that there is a basic problem in this.

It has been unsuccessful in other jurisdictions, and I believe that the minister has mentioned that, and I believe the minister has mentioned the spinoffs. I think that there are just too many "ifs" and too many "ands" in this particular legislation that we have to deal with. I do not support this legislation at all. I am sorry that this legislation has come forward and I am unable to support it. You talk about expenses, and I feel that the expenses are going to end up

in the consumer's pocket and the problems are going to end up back on the consumer. I do not think the savings are going to be there at all.

Hydro is not in favour of it. They believe that the bill would reduce the safety of electrical installations in dwelling units. People who now have access to electrical parts and products at hardware stores will not have access to these materials. I think there are just too many "ifs," "ands" or "buts" on the part of the consumer and I am afraid I just cannot support this particular bill.

Mr Mills: It is a pleasure for me to stand here this morning and talk to my colleague and friend's bill, the member for Lanark-Renfrew. I look on Thursday mornings here as a joyful time that we can debate each other's bills and we can say what we mean without any fear of any—

Mr Villeneuve: Is that the only time you do it, Gordon?

Mr Mills: It is not the only time, but I am running out of time. What I would like to say is that my friend and colleague the member for Peterborough is here this morning as a private member. She is not here to put any hex on me to make me vote against my colleague's bill. She is here as she felt to be part of this caucus, and I take very great exception to the member for Oriole who suggested that she would be here to put the stick over us. That is wrong. Having cleared that, I will speak to my friend's bill here.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. When you address the member, do not call him by his first name. Refer to him by his riding.

Mr Owens: He said "the bill."

Mrs Haslam: His first name is Leo, Mr Speaker.
Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: You understand what I meant.

Mr Mills: Yes, but I meant "the bill," not "the Bill." My time has almost run out, and I must say that I respect the member for Lanark-Renfrew. I admire him for coming here. Nevertheless, there are some things that I am not comfortable with and, alas, I cannot support it.

Mr Jordan: I want to thank all of the members here today who not only supported the bill but who have spoken against the bill. I regret the fact that the bill has been completely misunderstood. The Minister of Energy's report that Ontario Hydro is against it is not factual, from my information. I am sorry. I just talked with the manager of the Ontario Electrical League and he sees it as a major first step in introducing safety into wiring in Ontario.

These statements by my colleagues on the government side stating that people would be cut off from access to buy material is not a fact. People may buy their material wherever they like. The only things involved in this bill are safety and economics.

The safety part is, who is going to do the skills training? Is it going to be paid by you and me on our Hydro bill through the inspector, to train the individual who takes out the permit and has no training? The other thing is, are we going to use them as a skills development or

are we going to let a professional tradesman assist them in giving information? He does not have to interfere with the individual's right to wire his own garage or cottage or whatever.

1150

The saving back to Ontario Hydro, from the information available to me, could be as much as a third of the time that the inspector uses from May to October on inspection calls. Members can imagine when someone phones in to the inspection office, an individual from Ottawa, for instance, at a cottage out on the Rideau: First of all, he does not know his lot and concession, he does not know where he lives, and all of this is time that we pay that could be looked after by someone in the trade who would not only know the area but would know the profession.

I am sorry the Minister of Energy cannot see that the safety is here. The difference is that training will be by a professional tradesman rather than at our expense through an electrical inspector from Ontario Hydro. It is not only the inspector's time on the job at over \$50 an hour. It is the administration time in the office and the bad public relations that are created when the inspection clerk has to convey the message to the property owner that the work is not acceptable, that the material is not acceptable.

These are the points that were missing in this simple bill this morning. I am really upset to have a report that Ontario Hydro is not in favour in that they would have to take the equipment off the shelves of hardware stores. There is no attachment to that whatsoever. People are free to buy the equipment across the border, anyplace they like. All we are asking is that you have a professional trades licence number on your application so we have someone to communicate with in a learned way as to the proper installation of that equipment.

Really, I believe that the members, given a chance to reread the bill and assess it—I would like to see them consider the bill through the resources development committee for more consultation.

1200

INTERVENOR FUNDING PROJECT AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

LOI DE 1990 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE PROJET D'AIDE FINANCIÈRE AUX INTERVENANTS

The House divided on Mr Chiarelli's motion for second reading of Bill 39, which was negated on the following vote:

La motion de M. Chiarelli pour la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 39, mise aux voix, est rejetée :

Ayes/Pour—24

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Caplan, Chiarelli, Cleary, Curling, Elston, Fletcher, Frankford, Harnick, Haslam, Mammoliti, Mancini, Mathysen, McGuinty, O'Neill, Y., Offer, Scott, Silipo, Sorbara, Ward, B., Waters, Wiseman.

Nays/Contre—40

Abel, Buchanan, Carr, Carter, Cooper, Coppen, Cunningham, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Hayes, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Jordan,

Klopp, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Martin, McLean, Mills, Morrow, Murdoch, B., O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Sterling, Sutherland, Tilson, Villeneuve, White, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Witmer, Wood.

1205

ELECTRICAL WIRING SYSTEMS ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR LES INSTALLATIONS ÉLECTRIQUES

The House divided on Mr Jordan's motion for second reading of Bill 67, which was negatived on the following vote:

La motion de M. Jordan pour la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 67, mise aux voix, est rejetée :

Ayes/Pour—18

Arnott, Brown, Carr, Chiarelli, Cleary, Cunningham, Harnick, Jordan, McGuinty, McLean, Murdoch, B., Offer, O'Neill, Y., Sterling, Tilson, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Nays/Contre—46

Abel, Bradley, Buchanan, Caplan, Carter, Cooper, Coppen, Curling, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Elston, Fletcher, Frankford, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mammoliti, Mancini, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Scott, Silipo, Sorbara, Sutherland, Ward, M., Waters, White, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wiseman, Wood.

The House recessed at 1209.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr H. O'Neil: As all members of this House are aware, the NDP has unilaterally abolished the oath of allegiance to the Queen for police officers and police commissioners. The Premier has also indicated that the government is examining whether to expand the abolition to include public servants and firefighters.

The NDP took this misguided action without giving either the people of Ontario or the members of this House the opportunity to debate the matter. Instead, the new oath was secretly approved by cabinet and slipped into regulations without warning.

If the government is so proud of its decision to change the oath, why did it not tell everyone? The Premier claims the elimination of the oath to the Queen does not affect the monarchy's role in our affairs. Tell that to the people who are outraged by the government's decision. The Premier says he has not received many negative calls to his office on this issue. I urge people who support the monarchy to call or write the Premier's office and express their disapproval.

At this sensitive and important time in Canadian history, the Premier has chosen to damage a lasting and valuable symbol of Canada's heritage instead of enhancing this symbol. The NDP is tarnishing an institution which plays a valuable role in fostering Canadian unity.

I call on the Premier to acknowledge his mistake and reinstate the oath of allegiance to Her Majesty. At the very least, the implementation of the new oath should be delayed until the members of this House and the people of this province have been given the opportunity to debate the issue fully and openly.

SHELTER FOR WOMEN

Mr Carr: Halton Women's Shelter is the only shelter in Halton region for the abused women and their children. This one shelter is located in the town of Milton in the north of the region, and it provides a temporary home for up to 18 women at a time. The home is staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Counselling is offered to the women and their children. Women also receive assistance in health and life skills, and a community worker is available to accompany the woman to court if required.

While these services have proven to be essential to many abused women and their children in the region, the northern location virtually restricts access to the 25% of those who live in the Milton or Halton Hills area. The remaining 75% live in Burlington and Oakville, where there is no shelter for abused women. The lack of public transportation between the north and the south presents a major barrier to the women in the south who do not have their own means of transportation.

Many surveys and studies have been done which have identified the urgent need for a shelter for abused

women in the southern area of Halton. I sincerely hope the ministers of both women's issues and Community and Social Services will recognize this need. I urge them to ensure we in Oakville and Burlington receive a shelter.

ST CATHARINES STANDARD

Ms Haeck: I rise today to salute the St Catharines Standard on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of its founding. On 21 April 1891, two Torontonians founded the Standard in a city that already had three other daily newspapers. After less than a year, the founders faced bankruptcy. In early 1892 their print shop foreman, William Burgoyne, stepped in to purchase the paper for the sum of \$1.

Today, under the direction of publisher Harry Burgoyne, great-grandson of the founder, the Standard has 300 employees and has for many decades been the only daily newspaper in St Catharines.

Under managing editor Murray Thomson the newspaper regularly wins prizes for its local and regional reporting. It is notable also for being one of only four family-owned newspapers left in all of Ontario.

The Standard is also the cornerstone of a publishing enterprise that includes at least six weeklies in Niagara and other daily papers as far away as Cobourg and Port Hope. The Standard even publishes the Canada News, well known to vacationers in Florida.

I salute the St Catharines Standard. Although the Standard and I occasionally do not see eye to eye on politics, I am glad to recognize its considerable contributions to shaping the St Catharines that we know today. Happy birthday to the Standard.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mr Cleary: I rise today in the House to implore the government to take action on the issue of cross-border shopping, which has become a public safety crisis in the Cornwall area. It is estimated that cross-border shopping may cost Cornwall more than \$12 million in sales, representing a loss of 120 jobs.

Cross-border shopping has become so severe that traffic jams are occurring along the Seaway International Bridge and along local roads serving the bridge. Two-hour waits at the bridge are not uncommon. The Mohawk Grand Chief Mike Mitchell has raised concerns that reserve residents may be in danger if the traffic congestion along the bridge area continues to cut off the emergency vehicle access to the reserve. In his comments on the issue Chief Mitchell also reiterated the well-known fact that low US prices, especially for gasoline and cigarettes, are luring Canadians across the border and clogging access to the reserve.

The Mohawk police of Akwesasne have threatened to block the Seaway International Bridge in my riding this Saturday because of their concerns for public safety. Federal officials met with the Mohawk council to try to resolve this safety issue.

I would urge the Premier of this province to respond quickly to this escalating problem. With the impending

blockade of the Seaway bridge, the government should take immediate action to make Ontario business competitive and to encourage people in border communities to spend their Canadian dollars in Canada.

FLOODING

Mr McLean: This past week a number of communities and townships on the Burnt and Irondale rivers were devastated by severe flooding. Areas which were hit particularly hard include the townships of Somerville, Dysart, Glamorgan and Snowdon.

Is this government prepared to assist in any way possible the home owners, cottage owners and businesses in this region as they attempt to recover from this disaster? Water levels have gone as high as the first storey of many buildings, leaving basements damaged. Local roads have been washed out and drainage systems severely damaged.

Will the Ministry of the Environment be prepared to assess the environmental damage the overflow of these rivers has caused? The people of the region eagerly await the government's answers.

FISH AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Mr McLean: The Minister of Natural Resources has been making a lot of noise about the approximate \$1.5-million shortfall in angling licence money that has not been returned to fisheries' budgets.

The minister whines about the former Liberal government placing licence fee revenues in general revenues. He knows that once they end up in general revenues, they are gone for ever.

I would suggest the minister stop whining and bring forward legislation that would create a special fish and wildlife fund based on the revenues generated by all fishing and hunting licensing fees. If this was done, then maybe he would not have to close three fish hatcheries and slash the budget for the policing of poaching.

PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS

Mrs MacKinnon: This year is the 75th anniversary of the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations. The federation has designated next week as Home and School Week. I rise today to congratulate parents' associations on their valuable contributions to our province's educational system.

The three umbrella parents' associations are the Federation of Francophone Parents' Associations of Ontario, the Federation of Catholic Parent-Teacher Associations of Ontario, and the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations. These associations represent about 1,000 local home and school associations across the province.

As a former school trustee, I encourage more parents to become involved in their children's education and I also encourage schools in welcoming and responding to parental input.

Once again, congratulations to the Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations and to all the parents who have or are currently helping us meet the goals of education excellence.

1340

CHILD CARE

Mrs McLeod: Child care in Ontario is at a significant crossroads. The goal of affordable, accessible, quality child care, developed to ensure full parental choice and involvement, has been compromised by the Minister of Community and Social Services.

The minister in her policy statement of 31 January has demonstrated that she is not able to manage the child care system in Ontario in a way that reflects both need and reality. The minister provided salary dollars to the non-profit sector only. She has forgotten that 34% of the province's parents are choosing child care programs offered in commercial centres and has placed these centres at a disadvantage in attracting and maintaining qualified, capable staff and even in remaining open.

The minister has failed to manage exploding welfare case loads and has forced municipalities into a position where they have to scramble to meet their social assistance obligations and cannot afford child care subsidies. Peel region, where welfare case loads have grown by 90%, has notified the ministry that it is not in a position to take advantage of an additional 243 subsidized spaces. The minister's subsidy announcement has come too late in the budget-year process for some municipalities to take advantage of it.

I look for a sense of priority in child care and find none. There appear to be no goals for the long-term planning and expansion of the system. There is no attempt to maintain the viability of the current system to ensure that parents and children have access to the spaces they need. Child care is a necessity. It must be responded to.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Jackson: I call the attention of all members to the crisis of accountability currently affecting our provincial welfare system under the NDP.

The story of the burgeoning social assistance load in this province is well known. It has increased by 65% over the same amount reported last year. The Daily Bread Food Bank in Metro Toronto reports that it now assists over 120,000 people on a monthly basis. Over 300,000 children in Ontario are now living below the poverty line.

Clearly the number of those who suffer from genuine need in Ontario is greatest today. Therefore, we must address the problem of those on welfare rolls who either do not need to be or who maliciously take advantage of already strained welfare budgets to rob benefits from others who urgently require them.

This question is one of government accountability for our social assistance program. This was openly discussed by journalist Diane Francis, who was irresponsibly maligned by this government for making public her investigations into proposed NDP welfare changes and documented cases of its abuse.

This will be a costly political lesson that this government will have to learn, but unfortunately at taxpayers' expense. I call on the NDP to recognize that accountability

is the best way to ensure that those most in need of assistance will receive it.

Accountability means different things to different politicians. For the NDP, success of social support is measured by the number of people being added to the welfare rolls. For the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario, its success is measured by the number of people who no longer require social assistance.

FLOODING

Mr Drainville: The residents of communities bordering the Burnt River in my riding of Victoria-Haliburton have endured the destructive force of spring floods. Fortunately, due to the hard work of the emergency crews, there has been no loss of human life.

Since the flooding began last week, I have travelled through seven different communities gathering information on the problems that are facing my constituents. One thing is clear from these discussions, that the assistance of many groups from the municipal and provincial governments has been substantial and effective.

I would like to draw the attention of this assembly to some of the emergency crew members who have helped so many people in their time of need: from the township of Somerville, Reeve Bryce Young, Deputy Reeve Sue Douglas, Councillor John Austin, Clerk-Treasurer Tammy McKelvey and the staff in this small township; from the OPP at Coboconk who evacuated four families, Staff Sergeant Peter Alexander, Sergeant Patrick Dunn and constables Frank Sokol, Paul Bradley and Dave Fletcher. Fenelon firefighters Fred Elder and John Williamson were assisted by two OPP sergeants in rescuing two cottagers who spent a night on a cold and wet knoll.

I would also like to commend the work of the Ministry of Natural Resources that has done fine work throughout this difficulty. I would also like to say that the provincial government has responded directly and immediately to the needs of the people and they deserve to be given due accord at this time as well.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

The Speaker: Yesterday the member for Simcoe West rose on a question of privilege with respect to the changes in the oath of allegiance required to be sworn by members of police forces in the province. I have had an opportunity to review the member's submission and the relevant parliamentary authorities.

It may be useful to stress the very nature of parliamentary privilege. Standing order 21(a) defines privilege as "the rights enjoyed by the House collectively and by the members of the House individually conferred by the Legislative Assembly Act and other statutes, or by practice, precedent, usage and custom."

Australia House of Representatives' Practice notes that "parliamentary privilege relates to the special rights and immunities which belong to the Parliament, its members and others, which are considered essential for the operation of the Parliament. These rights and immunities allow the Parliament to meet and carry out its proper constitutional role, for members to discharge their responsibilities

to their constituents and for others properly involved in the parliamentary process to carry out their duties and responsibilities without obstruction or fear of prosecution."

These special rights and immunities of the House and its members include the right of free speech in Parliament, immunity from arrest or detention for civil causes during defined periods, immunity of members from the obligation to serve on juries, immunity of witnesses from being questioned or impeached for evidence given before the House or its committees, the right of the House to establish its own rules and enforce them, the power to expel members and the power to order the arrest and imprisonment of persons guilty of contempt or breach of privilege. It is only in very restricted circumstances that there can come to the House a legitimate case of privilege on the basis of the real, accepted and traditional definition of parliamentary privilege.

It is my opinion that the circumstances raised by the member for Simcoe West do not fall within the definition of privilege I have cited. There is no indication that the House and its members have been impeded in the performance of their duties as a result of the changes in the oath of allegiance required to be sworn by members of Ontario's police forces. Accordingly, I must rule that a *prima facie* case of privilege has not been established which would permit the matter to take precedence over the other business of the House.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Speaker: Further, before beginning oral questions, I hope the House will bear with me for a few moments while I consider some of the concerns that have been raised with me and others regarding the conduct of question period. In recent weeks, I have been keeping track of the time used by questioners and those providing responses during this very important part of our proceedings. The figures make it clear that both the questions and the responses are becoming longer and therefore fewer members get to ask a question.

Our standing orders set out very rigidly how our question period is to be run, and very little discretion, if any, is left to the Speaker in that sense. Furthermore, our question period is a full 60 minutes long, which should provide the necessary time for many members to ask their questions.

The point I want to make is that the Chair will undertake to use persuasion upon members who are taking too long to ask or to answer a question, but I would also ask that the members themselves do their part to assist the Chair by making their questions and supplementaries as short and to the point as possible, and that the ministers do the same in providing their responses.

With the time provided and with co-operation, there should be no problem in dealing with 12 to 13 or more questions every day. Actually, until recently, that was the average number of questions we were achieving. Hopefully, we can go beyond that number.

If the House leaders or any other member of the assembly wishes to meet with me regarding this matter, I would be most pleased to do so. This is your question

period and I am certain that by working together we can make it useful and productive.

1350

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

ADVOCACY AND GUARDIANSHIP

Hon Ms Ziemba: Later today I will introduce legislation regarding advocacy for vulnerable adults. My hope is that the bill will be referred to committee for further comment, particularly by consumers.

Society is judged, in part, on the basis of how it treats its most vulnerable citizens. Historically, many vulnerable adults have been victims of abuse and exploitation. They have often been silenced and deprived of the opportunity to exercise their fundamental rights. Such rights include the right to make choices, the right to participate in shaping one's own future and the future of the community, and above all, the right to speak out for change.

The Advocacy Act is the centrepiece of a legislative package to address this injustice. The companion acts, the Health Services Consent Act and the Substitute Decisions Act, will be introduced later by my colleagues the Minister of Health and the Attorney General.

In its simplest form, advocacy provides a voice for those who may have difficulty in expressing themselves because of a disability, whatever its nature, and who do not have the support of family and friends to assist them in doing so. This legislation is about empowerment, choice and dignity. Advocates will ensure that vulnerable adults have the power to make decisions and exercise their right of choice. For this reason, advocates will be responsible to their clients, within the limits of the law, and while they will provide information and perhaps make recommendations, they will abide by the wishes of their clients.

The advocacy program will be sensitive to the traditions and heritage of Ontario's aboriginal peoples and their right to provide their own advocacy services. It will also take into account the culture, traditions and religion of vulnerable persons in this province.

In order to ensure that advocates can carry out their work, they will be given the right to enter both public and, under certain conditions, private premises, and to visit privately with clients. Advocates will, with the consent of the vulnerable persons, also have access to individual records held by facilities.

In the course of their work, we expect that advocates will encounter circumstances in which the safety, comfort or wellbeing of vulnerable people is being compromised. If the advocates' inquiries reveal widespread or chronic abuse, neglect or ineffectiveness in such situations, then changes will have to be made. This may involve systemic changes, including new laws, practices and policies in both the public and private sectors. We are fully prepared to see that happen.

Our next step will be to set up an Advocacy Commission which will operate at arm's length from government. In keeping with our commitment to community involvement, we will form a broadly based advisory committee representative of the disabled and senior citizens' commu-

nities. This advisory committee will nominate candidates to serve on the commission. The commission will also be representative of the communities it serves.

Once the commission has been set up, it will develop standards and training programs for the advocates themselves. Some advocates will work directly for the commission, while others will be employees or volunteers of non-profit, community-based organizations.

In developing this act, we have relied on the help and advice of many people who have worked long and very hard for this day. I would be remiss if I did not say thank you and congratulations to representatives of the Ontario Advocacy Coalition, and especially to three special advisers: Judith Wahl, David Baker and David Giuffrida.

I am pleased to place this legislation before the House and to set in motion a new era of empowerment for vulnerable adults. I believe that ultimately it will give voice to those who have been silenced and forgotten for too long.

FORESTRY AUDIT

Hon Mr Wildman: I would like to announce today details of an independent audit that will examine the area of the boreal forest of northern Ontario that has been harvested. This is the first audit of its kind in Canada.

The main purpose of the audit will be to determine the success or failure of artificial and natural regeneration on previously harvested areas of the boreal forest. Regeneration on both crown management units and areas covered by forest management agreements will be studied.

For many years, industry and government have measured and portrayed their performance in regeneration in terms of dollars spent, hectares planted and so on. There has been far too little attention paid to the results of these efforts. The examination of the current state of natural and artificial regeneration on cutover areas of the boreal forest will provide new information on this one aspect of the forest ecosystem. This audit is an essential component in a sustainable forestry strategy. It will provide a crucial starting point and a guide for future investment in Ontario's forests.

There will be a public consultation process to finalize the terms of reference for the audit and also to review the findings. The information from the audit will be made available to the public in a clear and concise manner.

Successful regeneration is vital to the long-term health of our forest, forest industries and communities dependent on forests. However, to date, regeneration efforts have not kept pace with harvesting. Despite increased investment in forest renewal, there is a gap between the area we cut and the area of forest we renew each year. Last year this regeneration gap was about 20,000 hectares.

In the speech from the throne, this government said it is determined to see that our forests are regenerated. The independent audit is an important first step in meeting that commitment. The audit will provide a benchmark on the status of regeneration of the boreal forest that will assist us in developing our agenda for a sustainable forestry. Using this benchmark, the public will be able to measure the success of future timber management activities in the boreal forest.

The independent audit will be conducted by a three-person committee. The chair will be Kenneth Hearnden, who recently retired as professor emeritus after 15 years at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay. Mr Hearnden was a professor of forestry and dean of students at Lakehead. He also spent 21 years at Abitibi Paper Co in Sault Ste Marie and Thunder Bay.

One of the vice-chairs will be Susan Millson, who operates Millson Forestry Service, a company that produces tree seedlings in Timmins. Mrs Millson's company also provides silvicultural, research and planning services. She is a graduate of the forestry program at Lakehead University.

The other vice-chair is Chief Willy Wilson, chief of the Rainy River Band. Chief Wilson is also the chair of the Indian forestry development program and the chair of the board of directors of the National Aboriginal Forestry Foundation. The independent audit committee is here with us in the gallery opposite. Unfortunately, Chief Wilson was unable to be with us here this afternoon.

I am convinced that the people of Ontario want to see better forest management. They also want to participate in the decisions we make in managing our forests. The audit will provide the public, the forest industry and the ministry with more of the information needed to improve forest management and to participate fully in it. I am looking forward to it.

INTERNATIONAL CONSUMER WEEK

Hon Ms Churley: It is my pleasure to inform members of the House that the week of 22 to 28 April 1991 will be National Consumer Week in Ontario.

In proclaiming National Consumer Week, I am pleased to recognize the role of all who encourage and promote consumer education and awareness. I applaud their efforts, be it as community volunteers or as professional consumer educators in the school system, business or government.

National Consumer Week is an opportunity for every province and municipality to help educate Canadian consumers. My congratulations to municipalities that have issued proclamations in honour of National Consumer Week. These communities include Keewatin and Fort Frances in the northwest, Gananoque, Renfrew and Hawkesbury in eastern Ontario and Windsor and St Thomas in the south as well as Lindsay, Orillia, Midland, Owen Sound, Cobourg, Scarborough, Kitchener and St Catharines.

At this time there are some people I would like to single out. They represent the kinds of individuals and organizations that are making real contributions to marketplace partnership. I draw members' attention to the public gallery. Joining us is Joan Huzar, president of the Ontario wing of the Consumers' Association of Canada. I cannot see her any more. There she is.

1400

As well, I would like to introduce the recipients of the third annual Consumer Education Awards of Excellence. These awards are in recognition of outstanding individual contributions to consumer education and awareness in both the professional and volunteer categories. Barbara Beck of Peterborough is the volunteer consumer education

award recipient for her volunteer work with the Consumers' Association of Canada. Linda Routledge of Toronto received the professional consumer education award for her work with the Canadian Bankers' Association.

I would like members to join me at 4 pm, following question period, in caucus room 230 to meet these individuals and representatives of a number of other organizations and groups who have played an important role in helping plan National Consumer Week. By working together, our marketplace will continue to grow and thrive.

BUDGET

Hon Mr Laughren: I would like to advise the House that I intend to present the 1991 Ontario budget to the House on Monday 29 April at 4 pm.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Mr Chiarelli: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am rising on a point of order concerning the use by the government of the time that is available for ministers' statements. From time to time, members on this side have risen in their seats and raised objections about statements that were made that were insignificant and really were not new policy. Today and yesterday we had events occurring in this province concerning Standard Trustco which are so significant—

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat, please? I think the member knows full well that it is not a point of order with respect to our standing orders and statements by ministers. I do appreciate your interest and concern.

Mr Chiarelli: Can I ask for unanimous consent on a point of order?

The Speaker: You can try. What is the request?

Mr Chiarelli: The unanimous consent that I am asking for is unanimous consent for this House to permit the Minister of Financial Institutions to make a statement concerning Standard Trustco when we have a major Canadian trust company closing its branches across this province.

The Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent?

Interjections.

Mr Chiarelli: I believe the minister should be standing in his place making a report when he was fully—

The Speaker: Will the member take his seat, please? I heard at least one negative voice.

RESPONSES

ADVOCACY AND GUARDIANSHIP

Mr Mahoney: I would like to respond to the Minister of Citizenship and just say that part of our concern in this party is this: We have five critic areas and there are lots of people who would like to respond to this statement, but because of the workload the Premier has shifted on to this minister, we are going to have to keep our comments within the time frame. With two other ministries making announcements, it makes it extremely difficult for us as an opposition party to do justice to these ministers' statements. Some days we get no announcements. Today they come in with three.

I would like to say to the minister that we do—

Hon Mr Pouliot: Make up your mind, Steve.

Mr Mahoney: Well, give us some time to respond to the issues is the point, to the Premier.

I would like to say that the advocates issue is very important. I would hope that the minister would take into account the rights of families to deal with this issue and not create some bureaucracy that would take away a family's rights to deal with its own family members, that the bureaucracy would not get run away with costs and red tape that are totally out of order and that we recognize the rights of the family members.

I would like to suggest that this minister made this announcement last December and today has just regurgitated the same announcement. She could have come in with the commission today. She could have done something. Instead she is just rehashing old information.

NATIONAL CONSUMER WEEK

Mr Mahoney: Just to respond briefly to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, I was very interested to see that the minister has sharpened her political teeth on the rather thorny issue of declaring and announcing National Consumer Week. I congratulate her for that. I am delighted to see the members of the public in the gallery who are working on this very important issue, but I wonder why the minister did not take off the shelf the new consumer protection code that is sitting there waiting to be introduced in this House.

FORESTRY AUDIT

Mr Ramsay: We welcome the Minister of Natural Resources' announcement today on the forestry audit. I sort of look at it as building on the initiatives of the Baskerville report. As the government party said at the time, Baskerville did not count the trees specifically, and we welcome this second step now. I think Mr Baskerville started this initiative off in looking at some of the substantive issues.

I would like to say that it looks like this audit is maybe only dealing with the second growth. I would remind the minister that we have to be also looking at the old-growth forest in the province and would ask him to continue with those efforts.

The trouble with that second growth, and I think what the minister is going to find, is that after the widespread mechanical harvesting we had since the 1940s, and because we did not have sufficient regeneration until about the 1980s, we have what George Marek, a well-known authority of the forest, calls the junk forest out there, and that certainly needs to be looked at. As the minister knows and is nodding, the junk forest is comprised of a composition of balsam fir and poplar, not the best commercial-value type of wood that is out there. That really has to be looked at to see if we can improve our silviculture methods.

ADVOCACY AND GUARDIANSHIP

Mr Curling: I too would like to respond to the Minister of Citizenship to tell her that this is an extremely important act. In the meantime, as we said, the advocacy

provides a voice for those who may have difficulty in expressing themselves that, when we do appoint these people, is extremely important.

I am not very impressed with our way of going about appointing people in the last couple of months. I hope that these people who will be speaking on behalf of the other people are well-researched, well-thought-out people who understand the issues and not political appointments, not people blessed by the Premier who feel that because the Premier has blessed them then the committee must follow through and appoint them.

I am not at all impressed at the fact that when we go out in the community, there are many, many people out there who would like to serve on these boards and these commissions. I will again touch on the fact that the Ontario Human Rights Commission, even within itself needs to be looked at with respect to morale, because as soon as we form these organizations, they are fighting within themselves and the cause is not being served properly.

We of course hope that we have got this before so that we can make sure that we have input. The minister still has time in which she can consult with us, and we will make sure that we have a good Advocacy Act.

Mrs Marland: We are pleased today with the minister's announcement. Certainly our party has long supported an independent advocacy system. This minister's introduction today of the Advocacy Act is an important first step. We look forward as well to the introduction of the companion acts, the Health Services Consent Act and the Substitute Decisions Act, in the very near future.

We also look forward to reviewing the legislation in detail and we hope that the government will in fact invite all the relevant interest groups to make comments and give opinions on this legislation.

I do have to make one comment of a negative nature, however. I would feel a little more comfort, I guess is the word, if this minister did not wait for this Advocacy Commission that she is talking about to address some of the needs that we know are already identified for vulnerable adults.

I bear reference to my question at the beginning of this week where I asked her about the safety of blind people in public transit situations. I was referring to the death last year of Rebecca Noble, who actually was a civil servant and died in one of our subway stations in Toronto. It was very discouraging for everyone who is an advocate today, without this legislation, for people with disabilities that the minister responsible for disability issues did not choose to answer my question, even if she did not have the answer. She referred it to the Minister of Transportation.

The Minister of Education continues to discriminate against Wally Elgersma, who is attending a Christian school and does not have access to a health care program that would be acceptable to him if he were in another school system. The member for Burlington South has addressed that concern with the Minister of Education.

I simply say we do need the Advocacy Act, but there are other actions that this government should be taking today. They know of situations today that exist that need

their attention and need the remedy, and the remedy itself exists.

1410

FORESTRY AUDIT

Mr McLean: We welcome the Minister of Natural Resources' statement outlining his intentions on the auditing and management of the boreal forests of northern Ontario. As the minister may recall, I made a statement in this Legislature on 3 December last year calling for the appointment of independent auditors to deal with the public perception that our forests are being mismanaged. The Ontario Forest Industries Association has been calling for this measure for some time to level the playing field and ensure the industry's compliance with regulatory practices.

We are pleased to see the minister address the very real public concerns about our present forest regulations, which emphasize the extraction of wood fibre over wildlife concerns. We also hope that the public consultation process outlined in the minister's statement leads to greater participation among environmentalists, the forestry industry and all others in this province involved with the valuable resources.

In summary, we welcome this announcement as a positive sign for the future management and conservation of our important forests.

NATIONAL CONSUMER WEEK

Mr Jackson: I would like to respond to the statement by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Although all members in this House share a commitment to improving consumer protection in this province, we do not share, however, common beliefs with respect to how consumers are being protected by this government.

I wish to draw to this minister's attention that she is now a member of a cabinet that has severely inhibited and severely damaged the rights of fee-paying parents who have put their children in day cares in this province, because she has discriminated against those consumers of that service by her policies, which specifically limit access to commercial day care.

I would also like to say that as the minister responsible for the Ontario Film Review Board, she has sat by silently while people are consuming offensive and explicit X-rated videos in this province.

The fact that the cabinet has her hands tied would indicate to us that perhaps she should spend some more time talking to her policy and legal departments within her ministry and perhaps spend a little less time with her public relations department, which is what we have received today.

MEMBERS' MAILINGS

Mr Elston: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: If I might, I wish to forward to you another indication that the rules of the Legislative Assembly again are being broken by people sending out political information with respect to taxpayers' dollars.

Quite clearly the NDP logo is being displayed on the material being sent out by the member for St Andrew-St Patrick, and although I know you have sent a letter to me

about the member for Downsview, a point of privilege about whose mailout I raised earlier, you said it was not clear that party identification was a breach.

I can quite honestly tell you, Mr Speaker, that I find that very unusual, since it has always been a tradition here that nobody should identify himself with a partisan organization once he has been elected here, because our duties as members in the Legislative Assembly and our activities as a result of our membership here have been funded by the taxpayers. We have quite clearly, for the longest time—I have only been here for 10 years, but even longer than that—indicated to any member who violated it that it was a violation and that it should cease and stop.

In fact, Mr Speaker, you now have said that you are going to refer this matter out to the Legislative Assembly committee for another ruling. It is quite clear that the members who are assigned to that committee are in favour of the New Democratic Party and it becomes clear to me that they are going to change the rules and allow this sort of partisan identification.

For me, that is not acceptable. We should have no change in the tradition of this place. There should be no indication of partisan membership, because the members, once here, speak on behalf of all their constituents, and to mail this stuff out in a shameful demonstration of electoral superiority, at least temporarily, is not to be countenanced.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, to ensure that those traditions are enforced, because it has been clear and is clear that, unless the rules are changed, this is not to occur, but it occurs daily and it occurs, in my view, as a very demonstrated, co-ordinated activity by the New Democratic Party to breach what have been the traditional rules of the funding of the members' activities—the members' activities, not the parties' activities.

Hon Miss Martel: I find it passing strange that the House leader for the official opposition would raise the matter here. He knows, as does the leader for the third party, that we have all been invited to come before the standing committee on the Legislative Assembly next Wednesday to take a look at this matter that was raised with respect to the member for Downsview, and this particular item which he has raised here today. If he wants to bring his comments and concerns there, I suggest that is the place to bring it and we will try to deal with it there.

The Speaker: I realize that all of us have an interest in each other's riding reports. I appreciate the point raised by the member for Bruce and as well the point raised by the government House leader. I have, as you know, reviewed this matter previously. I have asked that the Legislative Assembly committee take a look at it. If indeed the committee finds I am in error in my reading of the administrative manual, then I would be more than happy to correct whatever error I have committed. But I think, quite properly, the Legislative Assembly committee is seized of this matter and I trust it will deal with it as expeditiously as possible.

ORAL QUESTIONS

NURSING SALARIES

Mr Phillips: I have a question for the Minister of Health. I think the minister will know that the hospitals across the province are wrestling, as we speak, with a very tough budget issue, and that is how they maintain their level of service and meet the obligations under the new contract with the Ontario Nurses' Association. I would remind the minister and the House that in December, I think, she said it was her intention and the intention of the government to ensure they supported the hospitals in their efforts to work out their relations with their nurses. Can the minister confirm to the House that it is still her intention to fund hospitals to meet the financial obligations that were established by the recent ONA contract?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Liberal critic on the matter of Health knows that the ONA contract was negotiated between the Ontario Hospital Association and the Ontario Nurses' Association. It is a contract, obviously, that represented what the Ontario Hospital Association felt it could pay in light of the transfer announcements that we had made as a government to the hospitals of Ontario.

Those transfers were at the level of 9.5%. They were the highest of all the transfer payments that were announced by this government for this fiscal year, and the Ontario Hospital Association and its members understood that was it in terms of our transfer payments to the hospitals for this year.

1420

Mr Phillips: If I might pursue this, because I think it is going to become an increasing issue with the government, I think the minister knows that nurses' salaries consume the largest single part of a hospital budget. I think the minister knows as well that the contract with the ONA is about a 12% increase in the nurses' budget in hospitals. It is the largest single budget item, and it goes up 12%.

The minister says it is a 9.5% increase. In fact, the memo from the deputy minister to hospitals on 8 April said that for 1991-92 basic provincial support grants to hospitals, to meet higher operating costs, will be increased by 6%. The largest single part of the budget is nurses' salaries. It is going up at least 12%, and the hospital grants will be going up 6%.

With that in mind, Mr Speaker—are you going to cut me off now? I will move as quickly as I can.

With that in mind, I was not surprised, although I was disturbed, to read yesterday in the Ottawa Citizen and to hear from our Ottawa members about the situation at the Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, which laid off I think 25 individuals, indicating it was a result of the settlement.

Is it acceptable to the minister that hospitals are being forced to cut jobs as a method of managing the nurses' wage settlement and that the jobs that are being sacrificed are nursing jobs? What commitment will the minister make to the nurses and the hospitals around Ontario, and particularly right now CHEO, that the wage settlement will not require ward closings and hospital bed closings?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Liberal critic for Health understands that the 9.5% transfer payments which were an-

nounced by this government to the hospitals of Ontario include a base 6% for the year-over-year cost increases of the hospital, plus other special funding arrangements which are made depending on equity payments among hospitals, growth funding and funding for special programs; a variety of special funding arrangements.

In the particular case of a hospital such as CHEO, the hospital then looks at the funding that is available through the transfer arrangements and decides how it can allocate its own budget and determine the best way and the most effective way of providing services to the community. In the case of CHEO, it has decided to increase its ambulatory patient services, its outpatient care, and it has announced that there will be some layoff of staff. They expect that some of those personnel changes will be incorporated within their own personnel rearrangements within the hospital.

I am hopeful that they will be able to continue to provide the high level of care they have in the past in our community, and I know the Ministry of Health will co-operate with them as they seek to become more efficient and more effective in their provision of service.

Mr Phillips: I honestly do not think it is going to wash. I think the people in the health care area have watched the minister's party in opposition and are aware of the statements the Premier, for example, has made in opposition. It is a fact that the majority of the hospitals are receiving 6% and that the nurses' settlement will cost at least 12%, so they are going to have a major financial challenge.

Many of them go back to the statement that the now Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, said on 15 February, I think; this was regarding disputes between the hospitals and the nurses, settlements between the hospitals and nurses, the working relationship. He said, "If it is not working well enough, then, as the government"—he is referring, of course, to the previous government—"which is the paykeeper, as the government, which is in fact responsible for paying nurses' salaries, that government ought to be there saying to the hospital association and the nurses' association: 'This just isn't working well enough. We want you two to get together and find a solution'"—this is the important part—"and we are prepared to be the funders of the decisions that you arrive at."

The Speaker: And your supplementary?

Mr Phillips: My point is that the health community sees through this. This is a transparent relationship. They see that the funder is the government. Listen carefully to the comments of the government.

The Speaker: Does the member have a supplementary? Place it, please.

Mr Phillips: Does the minister accept as a matter of principle the responsibility for funding the settlement as the then leader, now Premier, indicated on 15 February in this House?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Liberal critic for Health knows that the amounts which were announced by this government in transfer payments for hospitals in Ontario for this fiscal year add up to \$637 million in addition to

those funds which had been allocated last year; \$637 million is an awful lot more money for institutional hospital services in this province.

The Ontario Hospital Association had asked us for more funding than that. We explained to them that these are very difficult times financially and that we also wish to encourage our institutions, our hospital services, to move towards more outpatient care and to rearrange the way services are provided so that they will be provided as effectively and efficiently as possible; \$637 million extra this year is not a small amount.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Scott: I have a question for the Premier. I know the Premier intended to introduce a clear, comprehensible, easily enforceable conflict-of-interest system that the public would understand. Frankly, he has done nothing but create confusion, and what he should do is take the whip or the broom to Ross McClellan and all those people who advise him in his office about what to do. They have led him down the garden path.

First of all, he issues a statement on 2 April that everything is in order. It turns out that nothing is in order. Well, a mistake was made. The Premier takes credit for it, but it is those boobs advising him. We all know that. Then the next thing that happens is that the Conflict of Interest Commissioner writes us a letter at our request, saying that there are nine ministers or parliamentary assistants who own assets presently which under the Premier's rules should be divested. Then yesterday they arm the poor Premier with this secret memo issued to the cabinet which either says, "We've changed the rules, if that's the way you'd like to have it, though we're not telling anybody," or "You're exempted."

I put this simple question to the Premier. He has been badly let down by that booboisie around him. Why does he simply not do this? Why does he not issue a list of the people who have divested and what they have divested and the people who have not divested and why they have not divested? Then everybody would know for the first time what is going on.

Hon Mr Rae: That sounds like a good idea.

Mr Scott: My supplementary begins with the fact that I know it is a good idea. I suggested it.

The issue is this: There have been a dozen good ideas put in front of this Premier before. He says they are good ideas, and he never does it. What I want to know is: Is he going to do this? If so, when?

The supplementary question arises this way. Under the Premier's own guidelines, if he exempts a minister or parliamentary assistant from divestment he undertook that their assets would be placed in a trust. The Minister of Citizenship has undertaken or been directed—I thought she undertook, I think Ross McClellan wanted everybody to think she had been directed—to put hers in a blind trust. That is great. How about the other nine? Are they going to be required to put their assets in blind trusts as the principles require?

Hon Mr Rae: Mr Speaker, I hope you will notice how short my answer was on the first question. I will try to be equally short.

I said to the member that in light of what has happened I think that is a good idea, in order to clear it up. If I may say so, I think the member opposite has created more confusion than light in this area.

1430

Mr Sorbara: That's Bill Vander Zalm talking.

Hon Mr Rae: I undertake—

Mr Sorbara: Bill Vander Zalm used that. The public did not know so it is okay, there is no conflict. You have three years now.

An hon member: You will never make it.

The Speaker: The main source of the volume is also the member who wanted us to have more questions asked.

Hon Mr Rae: As I hear it from the member for St George-St David, he has asked me to do two things. He is asking me to make clear the list of what has been divested and what has not been divested with respect to my guidelines—not with respect to the law which he introduced, but with respect to my guidelines—and he has asked me to give reasons with respect to why certain things are being handled in a certain way. I think he is entitled to both of those things.

Mr Scott: I plead guilty in front of the Premier to causing confusion. After all, it was I who brought to the attention of the Premier that his press release was not accurate. It was I who compelled the Premier to release a secret memo to his cabinet colleagues indicating that the guidelines would not be applied in every case and if that caused confusion, and I can assure him it did, I guess I am responsible for it.

But the point I want to make is one to which the Premier has not responded. Will he require, where there is no divestment, that the assets be put in a trust? The guidelines require that and the Premier knows perfectly well why. It is so the assets will be managed by someone other than the minister or the parliamentary assistant. Why is that important? We should look at the Minister of Community and Social Services. She is a landlord. She is discussing the new bill with respect to rights of landlords in cabinet. If she is managing her landlord premises, if they are not in a trust she is going to have insider information about the rules the government is going to impose on landlords. That is why the Premier put that in his guidelines.

What I want from him today and what I think the people are entitled to have is his assurance that he will compel his ministers, who are not obliged to divest by virtue of an exemption, to do what he said they would do, put their assets in a trust.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me just respond very directly to one comment the member has made. If one followed the same logic that has been put forward by the member for St George-St David, one could argue equally strongly that a tenant who is a member of the cabinet would have similar, quote, "inside information." Let's be clear about one thing. This government has done more with respect to conflict of

interest than the member's government ever did or was willing to do or ever will do. In committee this party and that party have consistently said they do not even like the idea of divestment at all. More has been divested by more ministers in this government than ever took place under previous administrations in the history of the province.

It is quite obvious to me that having answered in good faith his first question, the member had nothing better to ask in the second two.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. It has been two days since it was revealed that his cabinet, without consultation, changed the traditional oath for police officers. Since then, the Premier will be aware as all members of this House are aware, that public outrage over this offensive action and this decision has continued to mount. My office has received more calls on this issue than on any other in my ten years in the Legislature.

The people of this province are clearly offended. They are outraged. Yesterday, when I and the member for Simcoe West raised this issue in the House, the Premier tested our intelligence and he tested the intelligence of the people of Ontario by saying there is no difference between the old oath and the new one. I do not believe that; Susan Eng does not believe that. If he believes, as he said to us yesterday, that there is no difference, I ask him again, why did he change the oath?

Hon Mr Rae: I can only tell the member what I said yesterday. I do not think his characterization of my answer is entirely fair, but that is a difference of view which we will no doubt have. What I said yesterday was that I cannot see how one can argue that, by expressing one's loyalty to Canada and the Constitution of Canada, one is doing anything other than expressing one's loyalty to all the institutions of the country, including the monarchy. That is the answer I gave. It is because of that view and because we felt it was appropriate for people to swear allegiance to the realities of the situation with respect to Canada and the laws and Constitution of Canada that the change was made.

Mr Harris: Clearly the public did not ask for the change, the police forces did not ask for it, the National Council on Canada-Arab Relations did not ask for it; neither did B'nai-Brith Canada, the Baltic Federation in Canada, nor did the Armenian National Committee of Canada nor the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, representing 38 national ethnic organizations.

I know that because we have contacted every one of these groups. In fact, I cannot find one person outside of the Premier's cabinet who has asked for this change. I admit I have not talked to Susan Eng. Very simply, I ask the Premier this: Was it Susan Eng who asked for the change?

Hon Mr Rae: I answered that question yesterday and I think it is important to be fair. The member asked me yesterday whether it had anything to do with Susan Eng and I said no. Today he is asking me the same question. The answer is still the same. This has nothing to do with Susan Eng, nothing whatsoever.

Mr Harris: Yesterday I asked the Premier if he changed it for Susan Eng and he tested my credibility and said no. Today I asked him a very different question. I am trying to find one person, one group in the province of Ontario who requested the change, not why he changed it or whether he changed it for that. I asked him, "Did she request it?" which is quite a different question.

This morning, radio station CFLY in Kingston conducted what they call "the people poll"; 93% of all callers want the Premier to restore the reference to the monarchy in the oath of allegiance. As I am sure his office knows by now, these people are not voices in the wilderness in this province. They are the voice of Ontario. They are the voice of Canadians.

Will the Premier admit today that he has made a mistake and will he today restore this symbol of Ontario's and of Canada's heritage?

Hon Mr Rae: I just happen to feel that at the end of the day, Canadians who work and who serve the public of Canada should be able to feel they can take an oath and swear their allegiance to the Constitution of the country and that that includes the monarchy.

Mr Harris: Whether one single Canadian other than Susan Eng wants to or not, the Premier feels they should do this.

1440

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mr Harris: My second question is to the Premier. On 5 April, the Treasurer of the province rejected the recommendation from the mayors involved with the cross-border shopping issue. The Treasurer rejected their suggestion of tax favourability for border communities and he rejected it for this reason. He said, "Where do you draw the line on what a border community is?" I believe he was saying to the mayors of the border communities, "It's impossible to do that."

Since the Solicitor General has promised to exempt border communities from the new Sunday closing law, will the Premier, for the benefit of the Treasurer and this House, clearly define what he considers to be a border community?

Hon Mr Rae: I do not recall the Solicitor General ever saying any such thing or in fact my ever saying any such thing in a number of scrums where I was asked this question, indeed in the House. What we have said is that we are going to talk to people and that is what we have been doing. We will be bringing forward legislation with respect to Sunday closings, I hope, in the relatively near future.

Mr Harris: Perhaps just to refresh the Premier's memory, I could quote from Derek Ferguson, Toronto Star, 28 March 1991: "The province plans to exempt border citizens from its promised Sunday closing law, Solicitor General Mike Farnan says."

By way of supplementary, 90% of Ontarians live within 90 minutes of a border. The issue of cross-border shopping is crippling the economy of this province at a time when we are deeply in a recession. The only response

we have seen from this government is the promise of a weak, piecemeal approach to the Sunday shopping aspect of it, one aspect of the problem.

The representatives from many communities are here today. I have two simple questions: One, does the Premier agree there is a problem? Two, if he does agree, can he tell us, other than setting up a task force, what it is he plans to do about the problem, from his perspective, of the provincial involvement in this problem?

Hon Mr Rae: There is a problem. It is not a Sunday shopping problem; it is a cross-border shopping question.

Mr Harris: I did not say that. The Premier was not listening to the question. If he would listen, I said that but he was too busy yapping.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I have listened very carefully to what the member said. In answer to the leader of the third party, what I am saying is that the solution to the problem can only come from the three levels of government and from businesses working together.

The problem of cross-border shopping is a serious one. It involves questions of customs, it involves questions of the dollar, it involves questions of marketing with respect to cross-border communities and obviously it involves questions of costs and marketing and a whole variety of questions in terms of the competition between our two sectors. That is why we have to work together.

It is not an easy one to solve, because the reality is that there are literally thousands of people who are doing it. It involves changing people's minds about how and when to shop and the costs and consequences of cross-border shopping, shopping in American border—

The Speaker: Would the Premier take his seat, please? Final supplementary.

Mr Harris: I do not think we need any more task forces or any more studies on the hundreds of millions of dollars it is costing Canada and on the hundreds of millions of dollars it is costing Ontario. The Premier has acknowledged that there is a problem. He has given border communities little in the way of any assistance, though. The Treasurer has said, "Forget any help in the budget."

We know we have both a short-term and a long-term problem. The province of Ontario is part of both the short-term and the long-term problem. We have a tourist season coming up. We are asking the Premier now to fish or cut bait. Does he have any plan in place or any ideas to help either in the short term or the long term by way of correcting the part of the problem that the provincial government is involved in, ie, taxes in excess of any other jurisdiction in North America?

Hon Mr Rae: If the leader of the third party says we do not need a task force, he is taking issue not with me but with all the mayors of the communities in this province who have asked for such a task force. They are the ones who suggested the task force. It is the mayors of the communities who have. I say we are ready, willing and able to do that and to work in partnership with them and the federal government. We recognize there is a problem and we are going to do everything we can to help and to be positive about trying to solve it.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Offer: I have a question of the Premier. I am sure that he will be, as are all members of the Legislature, familiar with the Members' Conflict of Interest Act. I would, if I might, like to highlight in part section 8 for members' information, which reads: "A member of the executive council shall not...hold an office or directorship other than in a social club, religious organization or political party." This section goes on to state that the member of the executive council shall comply with this requirement within 60 days of appointment or exempt himself or herself by placing his or her assets in trust.

I ask the Premier if he is aware that the Minister of Community and Social Services, as recently as yesterday, continues to hold directorships in corporations, apparently in contravention of section 8. Furthermore—and I believe this to be of some great severity—I have a letter from the conflict commissioner stating that the minister has not divulged this information in her disclosure statement to the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, as required by the Legislature. Is the Premier aware of this?

Hon Mr Rae: I am not aware of it, and I would appreciate, obviously, any facts that the member has.

Mr Offer: Certainly we will provide that information to the Premier. But I would like to ask the Premier, given the very serious breach of this conflict-of-interest act, whether he will, as is permitted under the conflict-of-interest legislation, ask the conflict commissioner to investigate into the minister's holding, and in particular the corporate directorships.

Hon Mr Rae: I think, to be fair, that I would appreciate having the information which the member says he has. There have been phone conversations with the conflict commissioner. If the member has information other than what is available to the conflict commissioner, I think he has an obligation, in fairness, to share it with the House, to share it with the minister involved and to let us know what he is talking about.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr Eves: I have a question to the Minister of Health. On 21 December 1990 the minister is quoted as saying that she is carefully monitoring what is being paid for through OHIP, speaking with respect to drug and alcohol addiction in the United States, "We are checking travel expenses, frills, and we are cutting them off."

The minister will be aware, of course, of the CBC interview last night with a particular patient who billed OHIP for drug treatment in the United States at six different institutions over a period of two years at the amount of \$500,000. This money included such items as pills, group therapy and laundry. The individual says that he went without getting any kind of an okay from OHIP. He also says that he received \$11,000, payable to him. When he did not fill out the appropriate OHIP claims forms, they sent him a cheque directly for \$11,000. What he did with that money was he bought clothes and put a little aside for his return to Toronto. How can this be when the minister said that she was cutting this off on 21 December?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The gentleman in question, Wayne Ethier, in fact returned to Ontario—

Mr Scott: A minister was prosecuted in New Brunswick for doing that.

Mr Elston: That is a breach of the privacy act. You are not supposed to name people.

Hon Ms Gigantes: He was notified on 17 December 1990 that OHIP was finished paying for him. He returned to Toronto on 30 or 31 December, according to our information, which means that when I indicated that we were following up such cases, which are unfortunately cases that have existed in the operation of OHIP and in our policies for out-of-country payment of medical services—

Mr Bradley: The CBC did not reveal his name. First time I knew it.

Hon Ms Gigantes: When I indicated in December that we were following up, we were.

Mr Eves: As early as 1988 the Provincial Auditor reported this problem to the then Minister of Health. The minister has said that she has cut this out on 21 December 1990. She also said on 21 January 1991 that in the future people will not be using a self-referral system. That is the minister's statement.

1450

From talking to Dr MacMillan, her assistant deputy minister in charge of OHIP, he tells my office that there is no such ban on self-referral systems. It is suggested to patients that they get referrals—not mandatory, suggested. But in fact OHIP is still paying for treatment in the United States without any sort of referral whatsoever.

The minister said she was dealing with the problem. She has the Hansen report that has been sitting on her desk, by a US consulting firm that she hired to look into this instead of a Canadian consulting firm, I might add. It has been sitting on her desk since 1 March. What about these ambiguities? She said there have to be referrals. Dr MacMillan says there does not. She said she has solved the problem. It is not solved. How does she explain this?

Hon Ms Gigantes: The Health critic for the Conservative Party has managed to confuse the general with the particular, a statement about my intention in the future to have referral policies in place with the fact that they are not yet in place. As we have discussed this very policy area several times in the Legislature, I have always tried to make it clear that we are working on the development of a comprehensive set of policies and I think that he will feel reassured by my statement to him here today that he can expect the announcement of those policies within the very short future.

The past was not our problem. We did, when we came in, begin to address this problem, and we will make sure that he will be among the first to have a copy of our announcement when we make it in the very short future.

ONTARIO PRODUCE

Mr Abel: My question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Many consumers are increasingly concerned about possible chemical residues in the food that they eat. At the same time, we need to support the farmers

of this province as they go through very difficult economic times. Can the minister explain what kinds of programs his ministry has to address the concerns of consumers about chemicals, both in food and the environment, and which at the same time address the economic needs of farmers?

Hon Mr Buchanan: First of all, I would like to assure the member that this ministry and indeed the farmers of this province are committed to reducing the amount of chemicals that they use in their operations. As part of that, we have the system called Food Systems 2002, which is a three-pronged approach. It looks at our providing more information and research on integrated pest management, providing some more research on how to reduce the use of pesticides and look at alternative pest controls. Third, we are looking at education of producers and vendors as to how to deal with pesticides safely.

Finally, we are building a new food lab in Guelph which will allow us to test foods for residues and we will have probably the most modern lab in North America. We will be able to reassure consumers that the food they are eating is safe indeed, and may perhaps be the safest in North America.

Mr Abel: Can the minister describe in some more detail what kind of assistance is provided to farmers who wish to use fewer chemicals and pesticides.

Hon Mr Buchanan: Assistance for farmers to date has come primarily from our land stewardship program which deals with soil conservation, with use and handling of wastes and chemicals. Second, we are doing research at our agricultural colleges and research stations in order to come up with alternative practices.

Finally, I would like to add that we are looking to collect information on ecological farming practices. We have found that there is a need to have that kind of information available for farmers who are interested in doing that. We have now in our ministry started making that information available to people who are interested in having it.

The Speaker: New question, the member for Halton Centre.

Mrs Sullivan: My question is to the Minister of the Environment.

The Speaker: Is there a point of order?

Mrs Sullivan: Can we stop the clock?

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Hon Ms Gigantes: Mr Speaker, I believe I have a point of privilege. I understand that as I was answering the question from the Liberal Health critic—

Some hon members: Conservative.

Hon Ms Gigantes: Conservative. Sorry about that. They all look the same.

Interjections.

Hon Ms Gigantes: From this side. I understand that some of his colleagues were suggesting that what I was saying about the gentleman whom we were discussing and about the case was confidential information. I am horrified

that anybody would think so. I would like to make it clear that the gentleman in question in fact gave permission to the CBC to request under freedom of information all materials related to his confidential medical records. We complied with his request and gave that information to the CBC. That is how the information becomes a question of public record.

Mr Elston: On the same point, Mr Speaker: Because a third party receives a consent for release of information under that act, it does not allow a minister of the crown to release that information to the entire world. That is not a consent by that person to have the information released to everybody. The CBC asked for the information, received it, and maintained the confidentiality of that individual.

The act prevents people who are in charge of personal information, personal files, from making public that individual's situation. There was no name attached. This has been a clear violation of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. There have been in this nation of ours two prosecutions in other jurisdictions of ministers who in fact have released private information, and this is information of the most private nature that I could ever think of. That minister has violated a statute that is now poisoning the life of that individual by making his name public right across the province, from Cornwall to Kenora, from Windsor to Moosonee. Everybody knows.

It is not sufficient for the minister to say a third party was given his consent for their purposes. The rest of us were not. Mr Speaker, I think you should look into the act of violating the provincial statute by this minister who is in charge of the most personal information on every person in this province. She should resign for this most unfortunate breach of the privacy portion of that statute.

Mr Eves: On the same point, Mr Speaker: I could not agree more with the House leader of the Liberal Party. It is exactly why I did not use the gentleman's name during my question, and I must say that the previous minister certainly never breached that confidentiality. The only time the minister can use an individual's name is when she specifically gets that person's consent for her purposes.

The Speaker: Perhaps the minister would just take her seat for a moment.

I listened carefully to the points raised by the Minister of Health, the member for Bruce and the member for Parry Sound. I will consider the matter. It is not a point of privilege. It certainly is a point of disagreement. I take the matter seriously. I will take a look at it and I will report back to the House as quickly as possible.

I take it we still have an interest in question period.

Mr Kwinter: This gives a new meaning to NDP: 'nother dumb policy.

The Speaker: Would you allow your seatmate to place a question.

HAZARDOUS WASTE

Mrs Sullivan: My question is to the Minister of the Environment. The minister will know that X-Pert Metal Finishing, which is located in Burlington, in my constituency, shut down its operations in the summer of 1989.

Waste which was generated by the electroplating operations was left on the site. Prior to this and after, the region of Halton, the city of Burlington and the Ministry of the Environment all took steps to control the site. On 2 January of this year a burst water pipe caused a spill. Public concern was sparked when the extent of the hazardous products which were on the site became known in the community. The Ministry of the Environment is monitoring the site and Barnes Security has been on a 24-hour patrol since early March.

I am asking the minister if she would agree that the authority to act in this matter is in her hands and if the environmental decommissioning of this site, not just fencing the site or providing a security patrol, is what is needed.

Hon Mrs Grier: I entirely agree with the member that this is a very serious situation. The company abandoned the site and left I forget how many barrels there containing toxic compounds. There is not a great deal of security on the site. The ministry had in fact put security on the site in response to concerns from the residents, had beefed that up, and we have now issued a draft control order to X-Pert ordering them to clean up. They have responded to that and our next step will be to consider issuing an actual control order. They will have, under the law, time to act on that control order, and if they fail to do so, we will be in a position to take more action.

1500

Mrs Sullivan: The comments of the minister in fact will not be of much concern to the neighbours of the site, the residents of Burlington, or to the Burlington city council, because she has glossed over several facts although she has alluded to some of them. First of all, security guards have been found to be asleep while they are on duty. Some 3,000 to 5,000 gallons of cyanide chemicals in addition to an equal volume of acid chemicals are stored on the site. That is a lethal combination.

The chemicals are stored in an unsegregated fashion in deteriorated containers. The site is not fully fenced. Part of it is accessible to children through an orchard at the rear. Houses are located as close as 50 feet to the site, and the area close to the site is densely populated. There is clear reason to expect that the owners, who have not met their previous obligations, will not meet their obligations to clean up the site now with or without an order.

The city of Burlington has demanded that the minister expedite the cleanup. There is a potential for human and environmental disaster here that could dwarf Hagersville. The minister can act now; she has the authority. Will she use her powers now, step in with the money for the immediate cleanup of the site and get those chemicals out of there?

Hon Mrs Grier: I entirely share the member's concern about the security on the site and I am very disturbed at what she says, that the site is now accessible. Certainly my information was that when there was a breach of the security, the security guard was dismissed and that the security had in fact remained tight.

Contrary to what the member says, I do not have the legal right at this point to move in and act. The compounds that are there are certainly hazardous but we believe they do not pose an immediate hazard, and under the law the company has 15 days to appeal the control order. When that time has expired, then we have the right to move in and take action, and I can assure the members that is precisely what I intend to do as soon as the legal appeal process has expired.

SCHOOL BOARD STRIKE

Mr Villeneuve: The Minister of Education is no doubt aware of the fact that the Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry County Roman Catholic Separate School Board is on strike in part of the area that I cover. Can the minister tell us what guarantees she can provide to ensure that students receive their grades in order that they can apply for post-secondary education this fall? Applications have to go in very shortly. Can she provide us with some sort of assurance as to what she can do to guarantee us this?

Hon Mrs Boyd: I know that the people in SDG are very concerned about that strike and obviously the students and their families are increasingly concerned about the situation, and I empathize with that. As the member knows, the School Boards and Teachers Collective Negotiations Act enables the commission to advise us when it believes that the length of a strike is endangering the success of students. They have not done so yet. I cannot and obviously would not act until they do advise the Lieutenant Governor in Council of that.

Mr Villeneuve: I am sure the minister is aware that the teachers did finish marking the papers that were written by the students. However, they were not provided with the grades and the results of those papers. If there is any further delay, these students will miss their applications for post-secondary education. Does the minister feel that the teachers are acting in a legal manner by withholding papers which have been marked and yet they tell us they do not use the students as pawns in this? Does the minister think they are acting legally?

Hon Mrs Boyd: As far as I am aware, they are well within their rights when they are in a strike position to do so. I was not aware that was the particular situation because, of course, it really behooves a Minister of Education not to become closely involved with this kind of a situation. There is an arm's-length provision in the law. However, now that the member has raised that issue, I would be happy to ensure that the Education Relations Commission is aware of that and takes into consideration whether or not a recommendation is made to the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

CHILD CARE

Mr Hansen: My question also is to the Minister of Education. Currently, capital grants are provided to school boards for the construction of child care facilities only in new and replacement schools. How does the minister intend to address this inflexible situation to ensure that funds are allocated to schools where the facilities are really needed?

Hon Mrs Boyd: This issue was raised in connection with the second reading discussion of Bill 30, which is before the House and which I certainly hope we can continue discussing very soon. The members of the opposition party and the third party, as well as boards of trustees, teachers and parents across the province, have indicated to us as a government that they would like to see more flexibility in terms of the allocations of those funds. When we come to discuss the bill in detail, the government is quite prepared to come and outline exactly how that flexibility can best be achieved to meet the needs of communities.

FLOODING

Mr Ramsay: I just sent over to the Minister of Natural Resources some pictures of the flooding that was referred to earlier in one of the members' statements today. I find it very strange that the member for Victoria-Haliburton made such a self-congratulatory statement in the House and paraded municipal officials here. I went up to his riding, after he did not having twice being invited to go to his own riding to attend public meetings of the people, 300 of them who are affected by this flooding. I went up there this morning to talk to these people, and they are concerned about what this government is doing for them in regard to the damage that is there.

They have the chance, now that the water is subsiding, to take a look at this damage and do some estimates of what it is. People are saying now that it is in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources what he is doing and if he has spoken to his colleague who happens to be his seatmate, the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are they going to assist these people?

Hon Mr Wildman: I thank the member for his interest. I am sure he is aware of the process that has been made clear. The crews of the Ministry of Natural Resources as well as the Ontario Provincial Police and fire departments and so on in the area have been onsite and have assisted people who have been stranded. They are doing very good work and important work. But the member should know that the process is clear. The municipality must request disaster relief from the provincial government. When the provincial government receives such a request, then the Minister of Municipal Affairs must consider that and make recommendations to the cabinet. We have not received such a request. We would be glad to consider it if and when we receive it.

Mr Ramsay: I would expect the member for Algonoma to have a little bit of sympathy as this very same situation happened to members of his own constituency on the Goulais River a few years ago when ironically he went to the then member for Victoria-Haliburton, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and asked for such assistance. That minister brought assistance of four government dollars for every one raised by the member's constituents. I think that the constituents of Burnt River could expect the same.

But if the minister is not today going to grant the assistance that these people deserve, I would ask and the people of Victoria-Haliburton are asking that the minister at least investigate and inquire into this to find out why

this happened, why the MNR level-testing equipment was not functioning and whether there was proper co-ordination between the various jurisdictions that have charge of the watershed area in that particular part of the province.

Hon Mr Wildman: I find it unacceptable to have a member get up in this House, after all of the work that the members of the Ministry of Natural Resources and other agencies have done to assist the community, and suggest that this government and the people who work for this government do not have sympathy for the people who have had to endure this flooding. That is just not acceptable.

1510

The member suggests that the situation is similar to the situation that has occurred from time to time in the Goulais River valley in my own constituency. It is similar in that there is high water. The similarity ends there. The situation in the Goulais River, as the member should be aware, is that in that part of northern Ontario it is an unorganized community. The process, therefore, is different in an unorganized community than it is in a municipality. The municipality is aware that it must determine that it is a disaster and request disaster relief. We would be happy to consider such a request.

I should point out, though, that in the Goulais River situation and in this one, provision is made to provide compensation to people whose permanent homes have been damaged. It is not provided for recreational properties.

EDUCATION FINANCING

Mrs Cunningham: I have a question for the Minister of Education. On Tuesday 5 March 1991, Ernie Checkeris, president of the Ontario Public School Boards' Association, outlined a proposal for restructuring the school boards in Sudbury. The consolidated school board model that he envisioned would allow each board to maintain its curriculum and programs but the boards would share administrative support services. Cost saving could be achieved in the areas of transportation, purchasing, financing, etc.

Does the minister agree that the consolidated school board model is more cost-effective, and will she launch a timely investigation to determine how much money could be saved if it was implemented across the province?

Hon Mrs Boyd: As I said to Mr Checkeris around his plan and have said on many occasions, when we look at the financing of education as part of our review, we are quite sure that particular proposal and a number of others that suggest the way in which administrative costs might be improved will come forward, and they will receive thorough consideration at that time.

However, I would remind the member that it is extremely important for us as a government to continue to protect the constitutional rights of those who have rights to separate school boards under our constitution, and that the separate school boards are very reluctant to even see this question opened because of their experience with public school boards and their lack of governance of their own school system in the past. So, as we go through these discussions, we can expect that we need to meet not just the financial needs but also the constitutional needs of all the citizens of Ontario.

Mrs Cunningham: I suppose I certainly agree with your concerns, but right now it seems that the financial concerns are almost as important as the governance concerns, because education just cannot sustain the quality we have come to enjoy in the past, given the kind of funding that they have now. As a result of the more recent tax, provincial share, I would say, in fact has not increased as the minister had promised. The 60%, of course, was the New Democrat promise. It was not ours; it was theirs. That is the minister's responsibility.

But I think everybody is concerned across this province about the growing swell of property tax revolts. It may be fair, it may not be fair, but everybody is concerned. Citizens who are fed up with high taxes are beginning to threaten not to pay, and that is a bigger problem for school boards. It could have an impact on the delivery of education right across the province of Ontario. It is a reality. Everyone in this Legislative Assembly is living with it now.

The Speaker: Your supplementary?

Mrs Cunningham: I am going to ask the minister if she is concerned about these emerging tax revolts, and what specific measures she is planning to introduce to ensure that we provide a high quality of education in the most cost-effective way possible.

Hon Mrs Boyd: I think I have answered this question a number of times in this House and will do so again. We are very concerned about the tax concerns of the citizens and definitely agree that it is not appropriate for these essential services to be paid for to this extent by property taxes. It is a regressive tax system, and we do not agree with that.

We are going to change it as part of our work on all taxation and on education financing. It is important that we do it right and it is important that, as we are looking at this, we look at all the creative ways in which we can make the funding of education much more efficient, much more effective and certainly much more cost-effective for our students. It is my belief that, had the extension of separate school funding been done in a way that permitted us to really look at our resources at the time rather than as rapidly as it was, we might have been in much better shape. So we have a long legacy of jiggled funding that we need to look at.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr Owens: I am happy that the member for London North has raised the issue of tax loopholes.

My question is to the Treasurer. I guess I have always heard that when you die, you cannot take your money with you. However, the federal Tory government is currently working on ways to help the wealthy take some of it with them. We have been informed that the federal government is tinkering with the succession duties that will allow larger loopholes for the wealthy to escape taxes on their estates.

First of all, is the Treasurer aware of this situation and, second, what type of effect will this new regulation have on the province of Ontario?

Hon Mr Laughren: I thank the member for Scarborough Centre for the very difficult question. The member is correct, the federal government has drafted legislation. The member may recall that back in 1972, I believe it was, when

capital gains were allowed to be put into a trust fund, it was also allowed that the gains that were realized on those assets in the trust fund would not be taxed for another 21 years. That 21-year period is up in 1993 and the federal government has now brought in legislation which is going to allow that taxation to be deferred until the death of what I believe they call exempt beneficiaries. Exempt beneficiaries are spouses, parents, grandparents and children. So in a sense it is a deferral of taxes that are owed on the gains and the assets contained in those trusts.

We have tried to look at the effect of that in terms of revenue on the province, and quite frankly I do not know what the effect will be. We have not been able to come up with a number.

SOCIAL WORK

Mrs McLeod: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister will be aware that at a press conference yesterday the participants in Project Legislation called for the immediate regulation of the profession of social work. The minister will also be aware, of course, that Project Legislation is a province-wide campaign of the Ontario Association of Professional Social Workers, the Ontario College of Certified Social Workers and a coalition of 50 major organizations.

In response to a question in the House on Tuesday, the Premier indicated somewhat surprisingly that this was something that continues to be under review, yet in response to an OAPSW 1987 questionnaire, the Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, agreed with the statement that there is a need for legislation to regulate the practice of social work in the province of Ontario and that if elected he would actively support legislation to regulate the practice of social work.

In 1989 the Premier, then again Leader of the Opposition, indicated that he was pleased to have helped convince the government that regulations are needed to ensure that the profession will continue to develop and expand.

The former government committed to bring forward legislation to regulate the practice of social work. I would like to ask the minister whether she will carry forward the commitments of both the Premier and the former government, whether she will recommit to introducing legislation for the regulation of social work in Ontario.

Hon Ms Akande: Certainly the member is quite right that we are, very interested in the legislation for social workers. We have in fact initiated a great deal of interest in this area because many of the groups, apparently groups to which the previous government spoke, have come to us, have met with us about such legislation. Some of those groups are quite concerned about the fact that legislation may have an effect on them, a lesser position than they are in today.

Those are groups that have been doing the job for a long time, that are representing ethnic and cultural groups which are different from the mainstream but which in fact have not the same qualifications as the social workers who have graduated from universities. Some of these have graduated from community colleges, so there is a variation in the types of legislation that are wanted. We are responding to these groups, we are considering their presentations and we will be bringing something forth.

1520

Mrs McLeod: The studies and the consultations on this issue have in fact been taking place for at least six years. The concerns that the minister has identified this afternoon have been identified in the past and were part of what was being resolved in preparing to bring legislation forward.

In the meantime, Ontario remains the only province that does not have some form of regulation for social work. I believe that the minister must be concerned with some of the documented abuses that were brought forward by Project Legislation in its press conference yesterday and that continue to exist because the public is not protected and because social workers are not legally accountable. I would ask if the minister would assure us that the legislation will be brought forward in an expeditious manner and if she will in fact share with this House a very specific timetable for introducing the legislation.

Hon Ms Akande: Let me first respond to some of the information that the member has shared with us. First of all, yes, she is quite right that there was in fact a consultation that went on previously. It was brought to a conclusion, to a decision about legislation which in fact was opposed by many of the social workers who have come to see me who were not responsive, were not accepting of the format of the legislation which was to have been brought forward by the previous government.

That in fact sponsored our taking another look at it and coming to our own decisions. As has so frequently been pointed out in this House, we are now the government and therefore it is our concern to make sure that we have legislation which in fact satisfies those who need it most.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr Sterling: I have a question for the Solicitor General. Under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, section 61 reads, "No person shall, (a) wilfully disclose personal information in contravention of this act." Subsection 2 says that every person who contravenes subsection 1 is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine not exceeding \$5,000.

Will the Solicitor General undertake an investigation of the Minister of Health for the statements which prima facie appear to have breached this act this afternoon in this Legislature to ensure that our laws of confidentiality are held up in this province?

Hon Mr Farnan: I will take the member's question as notice and I will act appropriately.

The Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired. Fifteen questions.

FLOODING

Mr Drainville: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: There were allegations made by the member for Timiskaming about what was happening in Victoria-Haliburton. I just want to say that it seems to me that those statements were untrue, they were baseless. They had to do with the fact he indicated that the ministry had not been doing its job and in fact that the government had not been doing its job. I have spoken with the municipalities involved and the municipalities involved realize that it is up to them to ensure

that they pass a resolution and then the provincial government has already indicated that it will move on that as quickly as it can.

The Speaker: The member may know that it is not a point of privilege, although for him, at least, it is a point of irritation.

RENT REGULATION

Mr Curling: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: For days I have been waiting to speak on an issue here and this was on Bill 4. I was elected in 1985 resoundingly, and in 1987, and again in 1990, to bring the issues to this House on behalf of the people of Scarborough North, and other issues too. Bill 4 is of great concern to the people of my riding and I have waited patiently until the round comes around for my time to speak. I waited and waited. I feel that my privilege has been deprived under section 5 of the standing orders. I am not able to present the case for the people of Scarborough North.

I think the honourable member for Dufferin-Peel had done very well in presenting his case. I want to ask, when will you, as Speaker, protect my rights of presenting the views of Scarborough North?

The Speaker: I appreciate the matter which the member raises. Unfortunately, the time to have raised such a concern was at the time when closure was moved.

PETITIONS

SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Mrs Marland: I have a petition signed by 1,509 people.

"We, the undersigned, respectfully request the Premier of Ontario and his current Minister of Education to take heed and expedite the following demands which are critical to a very large segment of the population of Ontario.

"1. Immediate steps must be taken to include a course in British studies in the curriculum of all Ontario schools. Such a course would enable young Canadians to appreciate the immeasurable contributions that Canada has received from Britain, the mother country, in countless human and material ways.

"2. Further, we ask that a program entitled British Heritage be immediately introduced into the curriculum for elementary schools, to compensate Canadian children of British origin or background for the fact that no provision has been made for them under the heritage languages cultural programs, to which all Canadians contribute regardless of ethnicity."

I feel that this petition is particularly significant today because of the outrage expressed by the people of this province in view of the decision of the current government's cabinet to remove the oath of allegiance to the Queen for our police officers in this province. I support this petition totally and I have affixed my signature thereto.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Tilson: I am requested to present a petition to this House from 13 constituents from my riding.

"Whereas people are being lured from their jobs every day because of the free money that is being handed out by the provincial government, outlined by Diane Francis in the Sunday Sun, section C;

"And whereas the recommendations called Back on Track are appalling and ludicrous;

"And whereas it will be interesting to see where the government is going to come up with all of this money to support this welfare program;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly" and the resolution is set forth, Mr Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

EASTERN PENTECOSTAL BIBLE COLLEGE ACT, 1991

Mr Sutherland moved first reading of Bill Pr37, An Act respecting Eastern Pentecostal College.

Motion agreed to.

ADVOCACY ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR L'INTERVENTION

Ms Ziemba moved first reading of Bill 74, An Act respecting the Provision of Advocacy Services to Vulnerable Persons.

Mme Ziemba propose la première lecture du projet de loi 74, Loi concernant la prestation de services d'intervenants en faveur des personnes vulnérables.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

1530

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon Miss Martel: If I might, I would ask for unanimous consent to proceed with the vote on government notice of motion 16 at this point.

Agreed to.

1536

TIME ALLOCATION

The House divided on Miss Martel's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes-63

Abel, Allen, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays-36

Arnott, Bradley, Caplan, Carr, Conway, Cordiano, Cunningham, Curling, Elston, Eves, Harnick, Harris, Henderson, Jackson, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McClelland, McGuinty, McLean, Murdoch, B., Nixon, Offer, O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poole, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

The Chair: I recognize the member for Eglinton with a point of order.

Mr Kwinter: Mr Speaker, I am the member for Wilson Heights.

The Speaker: I realize that, but I recognize the member for Eglinton.

Ms Poole: I will accede to the member for Wilson Heights and make my point of order second.

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATION

Mr Kwinter: I rise on a point of personal privilege that pains me, Mr Speaker. I am sure that it was not intended, but given the situation of last week—I understand the government held a reception to commemorate the independence of Israel. Last night the Premier attended, along with myself and other colleagues, a massive demonstration of over 1,000 people. I understand a reception was held today and the members of the Jewish faith who are in this caucus were not even invited. I just found out about it. I think it is a terrible affront, not only to the community but to these members, and I think it is something that really should be raised.

Hon Mr Rae: I can only say to the member that I am sure if there was a mistake made, we apologize and I would apologize directly to the member. He will know that I introduced him last night to the gathering. I will have to ask for some inquiries as to how that could have happened, because if it did happen, it is entirely inappropriate. I apologize to him and I apologize in advance to the member for Willowdale.

Mr Harnick: I too was affected and somewhat embarrassed when I met the individuals who were invited to the luncheon as they were leaving the building. I was asked: "Why were you not there? Why were you not notified?" I appreciate what the Premier has said, but I hope this will not happen again.

The Speaker: The members realize that technically it is not a point of privilege, but it is a sensitive issue and I appreciate the fact that it has been discussed here.

The Speaker: The member for Eglinton. This is on a different point?

Ms Poole: Yes, this is actually a different point of order, perhaps a happier one.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

Ms Poole: I understand that today is the last day that our pages are with us. On behalf of all members I would like to thank them for their hard work, their diligence and their patience with members.

The Speaker: Our pages have indeed served with distinction, and the comments from the member for Eglinton are most warmly appreciated.

Another point of order?

Mr Kormos: It is a point in the broadest sense and it echoes the compliments paid to these young people, the young women and men who have served us for the past weeks from cities all over this province, who have, I hope, enjoyed their stay here, as I have, and who are to be complimented and congratulated. I tell members that you

should be very proud of yourselves, every one of you; your families and your communities should be very proud of you. You are outstanding young people, some of whom I am sure will be back in this Legislature in other personae, other guises in years to come, some in the front benches, some in the opposition benches, some in the third party benches and perhaps some of you, God forbid, in the back benches. Enjoy the rest of your year.

Hon Miss Martel: Before I call the second order, I would like to advise you, Mr Speaker, that there has been agreement among the three parties that we will defer votes coming out of committee of the whole House until Monday after routine proceedings.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

Resuming consideration of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Section 9:

The Chair: Order, please. If you want to carry on conversations, please do it outside of the House. We are resuming consideration of Ms Poole's amendment to section 9 of the bill. Any further comments or questions or amendments? Do you have any comments on Ms Poole's amendment?

Mr Tilson: No, you asked for further amendments, Mr Chair.

The Chair: Ms Poole has moved that subsections 100b(1) and (2) of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"(1) Subject to subsection (2), this part applies to every application for rent increase filed after the 28 November 1990.

"(2) This part does not apply to an application filed on or before the day that it is 30 days after the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent if the application,

"(a) is made under section 86 of the act; and

"(b) applies only to capital repairs in respect of which the landlord paid or owed money on or before 28 November 1990 for work that has been done."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye".

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the nays have it.

Ms Poole: On a point of order, Mr Chair: It was my understanding that we were going to stack the vote on all amendments until Monday immediately following routine proceedings.

Hon Mr Cooke: We still have to stay at five to stack them.

Ms Poole: Oh, we must have five people to stack them?

The Chair: That is right.

Ms Poole: Would the member for St Catharines please come back? We need him. Stand up. I think we now have five people, Mr Chair.

The Chair: I see four.

Ms Poole: Well, then there are people standing over there.

Interjections.

Ms Poole: Just to stack the votes.

The Chair: Until when?

Mrs Cunningham: Which will be done on Tuesday.

Ms Poole: On Monday, I believe.

The Chair: Resume your seats.

Ms Poole: Every time? Okay. Thank you.

1550

The Chair: The vote is deferred until after routine proceedings on Monday. Just to remind members, to have a vote stacked you require five members to stand.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: The next amendment, as long as you are aware. I believe the member for Dufferin-Peel has an amendment.

Mr Tilson: I believe I have tabled the next amendment with respect to section 9 of the bill.

The Chair: Mr Tilson moves that section 100b of the act, as set out in section 8 of the bill, be struck out and the following substituted:

"100b(1) Subject to subsections (2) and (3), this part applies to every rent increase that takes effect on or after the day the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent.

"(2) This part does not apply to a rent increase proposed in an application or set out in an order of the minister, the board or a court if the effective date of the first rent increase in the residential complex applied for in the application or set out in the order is before the day the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent.

"(3) This part does not apply to a notice issued under section 92 if the order under subsection 92(1) on which it is based was made before the day the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent.

"(4) Part VI does not apply where this part applies, unless this part provides otherwise."

Mr Tilson: This is a further amendment with respect to the issue of retroactivity, and I do not propose to spend any further time on that issue, because obviously we have other amendments that we wish to spend further time on that have not yet been discussed. I will say that the purpose of this amendment is essentially that we believe that this act should come into effect when it has received royal assent; in other words, when it is proclaimed. The intent of this amendment is to eliminate the voiding of phase-in orders and to move the retroactive provisions that are currently in the bill to the date of royal assent.

This measure would allow all those who have applications in the system to be processed under the existing rules of rent review. Under Bill 4 a landlord would have to have

had the application in the system by 1 July 1990 to be processed under the existing rules, which of course is long before anyone, including the current government, ever dreamed that it would be forming the next government, and I think that is the issue that many people in this province are concerned with.

The retroactive provisions, as I have illustrated, and I had hoped to be able to spend time giving further examples, we believe are punitive and unfair. Landlords have made business decisions, and we have spent some time outlining some of those as examples, under the current rules of this province and now will be unable to recover any moneys that they have spent or any moneys that they are obligated to as a result of contracts with individuals to do work on their premises, and in many cases probably will become bankrupt or could indeed lose their homes and their buildings. During the committee hearings we heard very moving testimony from landlords who actually broke down and cried because they simply will not be able to repay loans and will subsequently go bankrupt. This was made quite clear to us, and some reference has been made in this House.

Under the Residential Rent Regulation Act an order could provide for phasing in over a number of years. I appreciate that there is another amendment that the Liberal Party would be putting forward on this, but we believe that this covers that type of situation. This bill, if passed in its current form, would void all notices of phase-ins with the effective date after 1 October 1990. Once again, we have argued that the minister is bound to honour—

Mr Stockwell: Do we have a quorum?

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: A quorum is present, Mr Chair.

Mr Tilson: Once again, we have argued that the Minister of Housing is bound to honour all orders rendered under the existing legislation of the day, and with Bill 4 he is refusing to honour that commitment to the province of Ontario.

Submissions have been made by the Fair Rental Policy Organization. They have put this province on notice that this action is unconstitutional and they have indeed threatened to launch a legal challenge to this bill.

I will not spend any further time on any further comments with respect to the retroactive issue, but I believe that more time should be spent. Those are my comments.

Hon Mr Cooke: Very briefly, this amendment was discussed at length in the committee hearings that we had outside of the Legislature at the standing committee on general government and I indicated to the critic for the third party at that time that the choosing of any date for this legislation presents its difficulties, whether it was 1 October, whether it was 1 November, whether it was 1 January, whether it was 6 September. All of those dates, there is somebody who disagrees with them.

Some of the landlords made the argument that any work they had contemplated carrying out should be eligible for pass-through under the old system, which of course would mean that you would never be able to change the law.

The phase-ins that the member refers to, I understand his argument but I happen to disagree with it. Phase-ins under Bill 51 I think were just a phasing in of uneconomical rents, a slower way in some cases of economically evicting tenants in this province, and had to be dealt with. There are many landlords in this province who will look at this issue of phase-ins objectively and will admit that under Bill 51 it was way too rich—the icing on the cake, as it was described to me by one landlord in a private conversation—that it just simply did not reflect anything other than additional cash that was unnecessary under the old legislation.

So I do not offer any apologies for that section of the law. I think that the phase-ins were unfair and that there had to be a stop put to them. There is legislation in other jurisdictions. I was speaking last week with someone from the mayor's office in Boston who was describing the rent control legislation there. They also had to deal with the whole issue of economic loss and refinancing of buildings and have dealt with it in a similar way to the way that we did under Bill 4.

The only other comment I would make is that the critic for the third party—and it is because of the point of view that he takes—acts as if Bill 4 has victims who are landlords and he does not talk about the 130,000 units which would have substantial rent increases if we were to accept his amendment. He talks as if it is a win-win situation if we accept his amendment, and he knows as well as I do that it is not a win-win situation.

1600

If we were to accept his amendment, there would be 130,000 units that would have additional rent increases passed through. It would be a major loss and a large number of tenants in this province would be unprotected. I understand his point of view. Besides his point of view on deregulation and leaving tenants completely unprotected, he would like to take sections of Bill 4 and water them down as much as possible so that Bill 4 becomes completely and totally ineffective. We are not prepared to accept those kinds of amendments. We believe in the principle of tenant protection and we are not prepared to accept amendments from the opposition parties which water down or eliminate the effectiveness of Bill 4, as this amendment would do.

Mr Turnbull: I was not going to say anything, but I have to respond to the Minister of Housing in that there is no reason why he could not be honest with the people who are watching this debate—

The Chair: Order. I do not particularly care for the member's saying the minister is not honest. I do not like that.

Mr Turnbull: I will withdraw that term and I will substitute it with the fact that the minister has not completely shared the correct information. I think Winston Churchill said it is a terminological inexactitude.

The minister is well aware of the Conservative Party's position, that we would increase the money available to make sure those people who are in most need, who cannot

afford the rent they are paying now, would have greater help, but we would not have shotgun retroactive legislation.

Those people who had been encouraged by Bill 51 to do renovations on buildings, whether he likes Bill 51 or not, it seems only reasonable that they should be able to recover those costs. The assertion by the minister that it was so difficult to find a date is utterly ludicrous, because it is a perfectly well-accepted principle that grandfathering of those people who have conducted a certain activity within the bounds of the law should be protected. This legislation has had a rough ride because of these kinds of distortions of the facts. Landlords were encouraged to do renovations and in fact, when you contemplate under the permanent legislation, as has been suggested, that pass-throughs of the cost of renovation will be once again allowed, it exposes the myth the minister is trying to perpetuate. I felt compelled to point that out.

Hon Mr Cooke: I do not want to prolong this because I am sure there are amendments the opposition parties want to put forward, but again, the description that is put on this by the member who has just spoken, that you can grandfather the existing units, is as if there is no loser under his proposal. It would just happen. Money would appear to 130,000 landlords in the province and they would just sort of write off the fact that there are tenants living in those units who would have substantial rent increases. That is not something I am prepared to do.

Under this amendment, it is not just 130,000 units. In effect, Bill 4 would never take effect and there would actually be an incentive—

Mr Tilson: Royal assent.

Hon Mr Cooke: Yes, royal assent.

The members opposite have been filibustering on this bill for several weeks, so there would have been an incentive to even go on further to filibuster, because they could have prevented it from ever coming into effect. I can be accused of not putting forward all the facts, but it is clear that the member who just spoke was not putting forward all the facts because he was not admitting the fact that thousands of tenants and thousands of tenant families would be left unprotected.

I would agree that the proposal the member who just spoke has put forward, along with the Housing critic for the Conservative Party on its approach to rent controls, is that it would deregulate and tenants would be left unprotected. Their solution is that they would then have rent subsidies provided by the government.

I do not know what the Treasury critic for the Conservative Party says about that. Every day they come into the Legislature and says: "Don't spend. You've got to cut back." Now today in one five-minute statement by the member for the Conservative Party—if we were to follow that policy, we would have to spend hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars in rent subsidies to adopt the program the Conservative Party puts forward, all in the name of deregulation, all in the name of the landlords of this province, hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars.

I do not see how the Conservative Party can have it both ways, come in in question period and say, "Cut back on taxation," and then come back here and say, "But we would like to give hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to landlords from taxpayers." We do not agree with that approach.

Mr Turnbull: Once again the Minister of Housing has managed, in trying to state what our policy is, to totally misunderstand and misrepresent it. We believe there is money being wasted in every manner by this government, but instead he tries to suggest that we do not have a policy which looks after the most needy in society. We would look after the truly needy. We would not look after the people who are paying much less than the average householder in this province in their gross income on accommodation. That is the distortion of the facts that we are seeing over and over again.

The Chair: Are there any other further comments? If not, I will now put the question.

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: I would just like to remind you that when I ask the question and hear only people who are in favour, I have no choice other than to agree with it, and of course it can create some embarrassment. I will leave it up to you.

Mr Conway: I thought you showed remarkable latitude on the last call.

1610

The Chair: Yes, I did. But we will now deal with another amendment that was introduced by the member for Dufferin-Peel.

Mr Tilson moves that subsection 100e(1) of the act be struck out and the following substituted:

"In this section, 'extraordinary operating cost' means a change in the cost of municipal taxes, heating, hydro, water, insurance, cablevision and garbage tippage fees respecting the residential complex,

"(a) that creates a variance of at least 50% from the same component set out in the building operating cost index; or

"(b) that would justify a variance in gross potential rent of at least 1% from the amount resulting from the application of the building operating cost index component."

Mr Tilson: Very briefly, this was a matter that was introduced at the committee level which I had hoped would be resolved by this time and it has not been. The section deals with the grounds for requesting rent increases during the moratorium period and the simple amendment adds the words "garbage tippage fees." I believe that was raised at the committee level, at least I was given the impression by the minister that he agreed there was a problem with that, but it was made impossible as a result of the building operating cost index, BOCI, formula. He indicated to me that he gave his undertaking at the committee

and, as I have indicated in the House previously, that he would get back with more information on that subject. That was before the House came back.

That information has not come forward. We believe because of this whole issue of the environment, which of course is talked about daily in this House, that there is going to be an added cost to the operators of the apartment units and that this is indeed an extraordinary operating cost, because it will be charged to the landlords. We believe it is as valid an operating cost as hydro, heating, municipal taxes or the other items in the bill. Accordingly, that is the simple fact of the amendment.

Hon Mr Cooke: We explained in committee that there was a problem with dealing with this item because of the BOCI formula. I do not think I made a commitment to the Housing critic for the third party that I would get more information and explain the entire item to him before we deal with Bill 4.

He can correct me if I am wrong, but I think what I tried to say to him was that we needed to look at this item, and it was appropriate to look at this item, in the green paper and for the permanent legislation. But the BOCI formula is in the legislation, in Bill 51, so if there were to be any change, it would have to be a change in the formula and that would have to happen in the new permanent legislation, not in the temporary legislation.

I think I explained that at committee, as did Ministry of Housing staff. If he has any particular suggestions of how this should work in the permanent legislation, I would certainly like to hear it. There may be a submission he would like to make on the green paper that we have not received at this point.

Mr Tilson: Yes, I hope we are going to get an opportunity to make submissions with the green paper. Thus far, we have not. We are not allowed to speak with respect to that process and I would look forward, either at the committee level or elsewhere, to being allowed to make comments with respect to the green paper.

Obviously, the amendment was made at this committee level out of frustration because, just to correct the Minister of Housing, he clearly did make a commitment that he would provide this information. He seemed to indicate he would provide information that would make it quite clear that we would not need to make this amendment. I simply read from Hansard, 21 February 1991. In the middle of this discussion, the minister stated, "I would be willing to share that information with the opposition critics after the ministry had done some assessment of the problem." This, of course, had to do with the issue that the minister just raised with respect to the BOCI formula.

He then continued: "I just ask the member to take my commitment that this matter will be assessed. We will share that information with the opposition critics between now and when the House comes back and see if there is any way that it can be addressed if the assessment shows that it needs to be."

I have not heard from the minister. The House has now come back and there is still silence on it, so I have put forward what I believe is a reasonable amendment to resolve

this issue because the minister simply has not honoured his commitment.

Hon Mr Cooke: I think we did explain to the critic why it could not be included, so we can continue to debate this, but I want to make one point. The member did have the opportunity of participating in the green paper. He did not take up the opportunity. Even the critic for the official opposition came to some of the hearings: the one in Etobicoke, the one in Toronto. The member for Algoma-Manitoulin came to the one in Sudbury. There were members from other parties who participated.

Mr Tilson: We are restricted from talking, as it is, and we are now talking about the green paper. This is an amendment with respect to tippage fees, and I have asked the minister to provide this information. He simply will not provide it, so I believe the amendment is in order.

Hon Mr Cooke: The critic for the third party did raise the issue about their participation in the green paper. I am simply responding to it, and I can understand why he is so sensitive about it. He has not come up with one positive alternative suggestion of how to deal with rent control during the whole period. All he has said is, "Kill rent control and leave tenants unprotected."

The Chair: Order, please. The debate is on the amendment of Mr Tilson.

Mr Stockwell: It is just slightly more complicated.

The Chair: Order. Will the member for Etobicoke West take his seat? Thank you. We are debating the amendment of Mr Tilson.

Hon Mr Cooke: I have nothing to say. I think the point has been made. He did not want to participate in the green paper discussion.

Mr Tilson: I will be looking forward to debating the green paper. It was made quite clear by the minister's staff that I would not be able to speak at the hearings. I would have gladly come and talked about this subject with respect to the garbage tippage fees. I was not allowed to do that. It was made clear I could go to some of the hearings—not all of the hearings, but some of the hearings—but I was not allowed to speak. I was not allowed to put forward this type of comment with respect to criticism of what he is doing.

When you are not allowed to speak, why would you even bother going? In fact, I suggested that perhaps the member for Eglinton and I have cardboard pictures taken of us and that we send them off to these so-called hearings that the Minister of Housing has had. That would be our participation, because that is really all we are going to be allowed to do, and that is all we are being allowed to do in these whole proceedings. It is a sham, and he is not even allowing us to proceed with these other amendments.

Hon Mr Cooke: I have to respond to that. There have been accusations made that I think are inappropriate.

The Chair: Order. There was an amendment that was introduced and the debate is to be on the amendment. There is no point in trying to discuss something else. It is on the amendment. If you want me to read the amend-

ment—if you want to vote on it, I will do so now. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: The member for Eglinton I believe has an amendment.

Ms Poole: Yes, I do have an amendment to Bill 4.

The Chair: Ms Poole moves that subsection 100e(2) of the act, as set out in section 8 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clause:

"(f) subject to the conditions set out in subsections (8a), (8b) and (8c), capital expenditures that, in the opinion of the minister, are necessary to ensure the structural soundness of the residential complex or the health or safety of the tenants or that are supported by consent in writing of at least two thirds of the tenants of the residential complex;"

1620

Ms Poole: This amendment is one of vital concern to the Liberal caucus. It concerns capital expenditures, major repairs, major renovations and major replacements.

The minister had put forth the concern at the time of the introduction of Bill 4 about outrageous rent increases and about luxury renovations. Quite frankly, we agreed with him in the Liberal caucus, and that is why we supported him on second reading of Bill 4. However, it was our opinion that there was a serious flaw in Bill 4 in that capital expenditures were not dealt with. I am not talking about luxury repairs. I am not talking about marble foyers. I am talking about necessary repairs. I know the minister has said that not much can happen in two years, so that major repairs can wait until the long-term legislation, but the minister is failing to take into account the state of our aging housing stock. I had earlier given the House statistics as to the age of our housing stock, and they are quite revealing. I will just refresh the memories of members of the House.

Eighty per cent of our housing stock is at least 15 years old, almost 63% is over 20 years old, 37% is over 30 years old, and almost 9% is over 70 years old. These statistics are quite frightening, because it is quite obvious that we need repairs to our buildings. After a certain period of time cement corrodes, electrical works fail, water penetrates caulking and roofing, balconies corrode, elevators break down, plumbing needs to be replaced, and parking garages disintegrate from the salt corrosion.

Some people have advanced the theory that it is improper maintenance which results in these items happening, but I would say to you, Mr Chair, that this is absolutely not true. It is obvious that all of these things have life expectancies. There are only so many times you can repair a roof before it has to be replaced.

We had an excellent presentation during Bill 4 from the Concrete Restoration Association of Ontario. They said: "I hope as well you understand clearly...that this is not an issue of routine maintenance. No amount of minor maintenance, as opposed to rehabilitation, could deal with this

phenomenon." They are talking about the disintegration of underground parking garages. "Waterproofing, without major restoration, only prevents the ingress of more salt and water, but does nothing to restore the integrity of the structure.

"Because the salt-induced deterioration was not foreseen until the mid-1980s, the concrete in almost all garages contains salt and requires continuous periodic restoration or complete replacement." They have warned about the consequences of not dealing with this matter. They have said: "I want to make it clear that we are not here to argue for landlords' interests or for tenants' rights or to advise you on the appropriate level of rent increases in the province. Rather, we are here to advise you of the effects of Bill 4, not just on our membership but on tenants and their safety.

"Ladies and gentlemen, Bill 4 is not in the public interest. Inadvertently it imposes a risk to public safety, and even though the legislation is temporary, its effects will not be temporary. Let me be clear: Unless this legislation is changed, people will be put at risk."

That is one of the primary reasons we worded this amendment as we did. First of all, the repairs have to be necessary. They have to be in effect when the structural soundness of the building or the health or safety of the tenants is in jeopardy. That is what they are talking about at the Concrete Restoration Association when they talk about the safety of the tenants. Yet there is no provision for capital repairs in Bill 4, none whatsoever.

I should make a reference to the three conditions that are mentioned in this amendment. Because of a recommendation by legislative counsel, we have actually put them in a later section, but they say, first of all, that the minister can disallow all or any part of capital expenditures if in his or her opinion they were required as the result of ongoing deliberate neglect of maintenance and repair of the residential complex. Second, the minister shall consider evidence submitted as to the quality and value for money of the repair, replacement or renovation when determining the amount of the increase under this amendment. Third—and this is a very important component which addresses the minister's concerns that rents should be affordable—the maximum amount the minister may allow in a determination under this amendment is 5% of the gross potential rent.

The reason I read these out now is that although this amendment will be moved at a later date, I do not intend to debate it at that time. It meshes with the amendment that we are proposing where we are looking at the structural integrity of the building. We are looking at the health and safety of the tenants. We are looking at consent of two thirds of the tenants in the building, and we are looking at quality of the repair. We are looking at neglect to the building and we are looking at a cap to protect tenants against the outrageous rent increases which the minister has railed against in this House. So it is a very, very reasonable approach that we have taken.

The minister has said, "Well, we don't need this in this interim bill," that we can wait for the long-term legislation. But I say to members that it is not that simple. Small

repairs will become large repairs. Things that need to be fixed now may well never be fixed if the landlord decides that he or she does not like the new legislation. We also have the case of buildings where the construction is half finished; it was half finished at the time that Bill 4 was introduced and the construction has not progressed since that date. These tenants will be forced to live in these conditions until such time as the minister in his long-term legislation makes a provision for capital. I really do not think that is right. I do not think that is fair and I do not think that is tenant protection.

I must say that one of the reasons I put forward this amendment is that capital repairs have been a long-standing concern of mine. In fact, it was a building in my riding, 221 Balliol, which had a successful injunction, at least at the first level, to stop construction in their building. The concerns of the 221 Balliol tenants were that, first of all, the repairs were not necessary. They replaced perfectly good counters. The counters they replaced were absolutely gorgeous. I took some pictures; I wish I had brought them today. The counters were wonderful, solid oak. You know, I would die to have them in my own kitchen, but they replaced them with shoddy workmanship, counters where the doors did not match. Tenants endured several years of this construction and these renovations. The quality was very poor and yet the items were incredibly expensive.

The tenants alleged that the middleman was actually a close contact, not an arm's-length contact, of the landlord. That is why carpets came from Sweden, that is why the windows came from Germany, and that is why the cost of everything they put in was double what members and I wanted to see in the buildings. Not only that, but the quality was poor.

So as members can see, the 221 Balliol case very strongly influenced the provisions that I put into this amendment, because I totally sympathize with tenants who have a huge rent increase. There are many tenants who cannot afford those rent increases and there should be limits. But surely the minister can see that, as a temporary measure at least, this amendment makes sense.

It is modest. It is not saying a landlord can put in \$10 million worth of repairs. It is saying that the most necessary repairs should be done and that it is the minister's definition of necessary that counts, not the landlord's. It is saying that tenants are protected by the cap, by the quality provision, by the fact that there cannot be deliberate, ongoing neglect by the landlord just so that he gets to put in capital expenses.

I think those are all very worthy aspects of tenant protection which the NDP government should be able to support. Ironically, the minister in his opening address on Bill 4 said one of the purposes of the bill was to bring stability to the housing industry. We have tenants living in half-finished construction, we have necessary work being put on hold, we have renovators closing up shop. We have hundreds and thousands of workers who are unemployed directly because of Bill 4: not because of the recession, not because of the time of year, but directly because of Bill 4. We have investors saying that they no longer trust the government of Ontario. We have antagonism and hostility

between landlords and tenants such as I have never seen in all the time that I have been working with tenants. This is stability?

1630

The amendment we have proposed would bring a sense of stability back into the housing market. It would provide work for those renovators and trades who are suddenly thrown out of work. It would provide protection for the tenants who want to have repairs done in their building. I can assure the members, if they think that there are going to be capital repairs done, if they even think there is going to be maintenance done for the duration of Bill 4, whether it be one year or two years, they are sadly mistaken. It is just not going to happen.

The effect on the renovations and trades has been absolutely devastating. I think some of the members may have looked out their window at the renovators and tradespeople when they protested last week. I sincerely hope of the members in this House that that is all they did from the second-storey windows. One thing they have to recognize is that these people have been forgotten. They have been told their firm has gone out of business. They have been told they have lost jobs because there is no provision for capital repair in Bill 4. But they have also been told: "That's tough. Too bad. Wait till the long-term legislation." These jobs are not going to come back. That is the real problem. You just cannot close and open up businesses like you close and open a box of crackers. They are closed. They are bankrupt. They have no business. Companies such as Wind-O-Mart Ltd are going to be and are in very dire straits. They cannot wait for any relief that may be in the long-term legislation.

So I say to the members from a tenant protection angle, from an investment angle, from a business angle, whatever angle the members want to look at, that there must be a provision for capital repairs, with limitations obviously, in this bill.

Just to conclude my comments at this time, I would like to quote from an editorial in the *Hamilton Spectator* in the latter part of March. The editorial says:

"Bill 4 now before the Legislature has two serious flaws. It doesn't allow for capital improvements to be passed on to tenants if they exceed approved rent increases, and it would effectively reverse rent hikes that had previously been approved. Mr Cooke has rightly maintained that landlords shouldn't be allowed to pass on the cost of expensive renovations such as marble floors, mirrored lobbies and fancy chandeliers. But his approach is too narrow. In many cases capital improvements are necessary and far from luxurious—concrete repairs to balconies and garages, plumbing, roof repairs and so on.

"It was disappointing that the NDP used its majority in committee to reject a number of constructive Liberal amendments. The Liberals suggested, among other things, that landlords be entitled to pass on capital costs, but subject to 5% of the guideline if the work was needed to ensure the structural soundness of the building, protect tenants' health and safety or where most tenants agree."

And the final conclusion? The final conclusion was that unless the government undertakes some necessary re-

pairs to Bill 4, its credibility in drafting a workable, even-handed rent control system will be suspect. That is the kind of atmosphere that the government has created in Ontario today, the attitude of hostility and antagonism between the parties, so that it is going to be extremely difficult to get tenants and landlords to work together on a constructive solution in the long-term legislation.

That certainly concludes any preliminary remarks I have on capital repairs, but it would only enhance the minister's credibility in my eyes if he now said, "We have listened, we have heard, we have paid attention, and we think that the people of Ontario have raised some very valid concerns about capital major repairs and improvements." It would enhance the minister immeasurably in my eyes if he would consider an amendment to Bill 4 to make sure that the tenants of this province are protected, that capital repairs are done and that the stability in the housing industry is vastly improved.

Mrs Caplan: I would like to echo the remarks made by our Housing critic, the member for Eglinton, whom I would like to compliment at this time for the excellent job that she has done on this piece of legislation and the criticisms that she has made, which I believe are not only valid but also very much in the interests of tenants in this province.

I had the privilege of serving on the legislative committee which was studying Bill 51, which is the existing system for rent review and rent regulation in this province. Over and over again, tenants came before that committee to say: "We want our buildings maintained. We want to make sure that repairs are done. We want value for our money." They would say, "We are prepared to pay a little bit more to ensure that we have a clean and a decent place to live."

Tenants came before that committee, and the minister knows because he was there, saying that they were very concerned about building maintenance. That was the top priority. They wanted an incentive in the rent review legislation that would ensure that their buildings were well maintained.

One of the major flaws of this piece of legislation we are debating today is that not only is there no incentive to maintain the buildings, not only is there no incentive to look at the health and safety issues that tenants are so concerned about, but the incentive in this bill has been to stop all building maintenance in the province, to stop all major and minor repairs within the rental accommodations in this province. My tenants are concerned not only for today but for tomorrow. They are concerned because so many of the buildings are older and getting even older and are in need of these repairs, and this legislation has created a situation where all building maintenance has stopped and tenants have been placed in jeopardy.

Hon Mr Cooke: That is not true.

Mrs Caplan: The minister says that is not true. He knows that is true. He has heard that from tenants. He has heard that from tenant associations. He has heard that from tenant activists.

I can say to the minister, this bill has created chaos. This bill has frozen out tenants who wanted to have their

buildings properly maintained, frozen out tenants who wanted to be able to sit down and to discuss with their landlords in advance what kind of proposals and what kind of building maintenance should be done to properly maintain those buildings.

The amendment that has been put forward by our caucus, by the member for Eglinton, the Housing critic for our party, I believe is in the tenants' interests. It is fair and it is reasonable and it is an amendment that would protect the interests of tenants in this province not only in the short term but in the medium and longer term as well.

I predict that the new legislation that the minister will be tabling in this House, hopefully in the very near future, will have to contain a provision for capital for maintenance so that buildings will be properly maintained, because he knows that is in the interests of tenants. He knows that it is important that buildings not fall down around tenants; he knows it is important that where you have salt corrosion in underground parking garages that that must be properly maintained, and he knows that tenants care about their health and their safety and that they want a clean and decent place to live.

I am very disappointed that this minister has not been sensitive to the health and safety needs of tenants. He has not been sensitive to the realities in Ontario today which are that buildings are falling apart and that tenants are in a situation where they are not having their buildings properly maintained.

As I conclude the discussion, I would urge the minister—he still has an opportunity, as we are in clause-by-clause today—to reconsider his position on the very sensible, reasonable and sensitive amendment by the member for Eglinton. I hope that he will consider that, because it is in the interests of tenants in this province, and it is in his interests as Minister of Housing to have the kind of housing policy that will bring about well-maintained buildings in this province.

1640

Hon Mr Cooke: I would like to very briefly respond to the member for Oriole and to say that just because she says something is true does not mean it is true. Just because she says that all capital expenditures have stopped in this province does not mean that is the case, and it is not the case. She knows as well as I do that the maximum that was spent under Bill 51, under her legislation, and passed through in the rent review system in any given year was \$122 million. There was a lot more money spent than that on capital in the province.

Most landlords in the province understand something that she does not understand, that her Housing critic does not understand, and I would expect that the Conservatives would not understand, but I am surprised at the Liberals. Rent is paid in this province for a particular reason. There is \$8-billion worth of rent collected in this province and it is our expectation, and I think it is a realistic expectation, that some of that rent should be going to keep up the housing stock in this province.

The position the Conservatives have always taken is—and at least their position is clear; I do not agree with it,

but it is clear—any cent of capital that is spent in the province should be passed through 100% to the tenants. That is the position the Conservatives have taken, that landlords should not have to spend a penny in capital; that should all be recovered from the tenants of this province.

I do not share that point of view. Their position is clear. That is not our position. Obviously, that is now the position of the Liberal Party, based on the position that the member for Oriole has just enunciated, that all capital, as she says, is now stopped because of Bill 4 and that no landlord will or should be spending capital. That is not a position that I share, and I am very saddened by the position that the Liberal Party has taken on this issue.

The Liberal Housing critic has—I am not entirely sure what her position is, because on second reading she voted in favour of the bill and then for four months she spoke against it. I am not sure what position she really takes on this legislation, other than that she has speeches that she can send to landlords and she has speeches she can send to tenants. It is kind of what I was used to when I was first elected in 1977. We used to always call the Liberal caucus the flip-flop caucus and that is the kind of position the Housing critic is taking now, trying to sit on the fence and take the side of everybody. But I am telling her, it does not work.

People understand that the Liberals have sold out their principles on this. They are taking entirely the landlord's side when it comes to capital, and they would pass through all of the capital; any cent of capital that a landlord spends, they would pass through. That is obviously the position they are taking, based on what the member for Oriole just said two minutes ago, and I am very disappointed by that position.

Mrs Caplan: At the beginning of the minister's remarks he said, "Just because you say it is so does not make it so," and I would suggest that he read Hansard, because in fact his remarks have given new meaning to that phrase. He knows full well that on the record there is very clearly enunciated policy in this province that was brought forward by the previous government when it looked at rent regulation.

As it went through that committee process—and I was a member of that committee and I referred to it in my opening remarks—we always said that the desire was to come to a balance of the needs of the tenants for a clean and decent place to live and a balance for tenants to have not an unjustifiable rental increase. We brought together landlords and tenants, and the legislation that is in place today is a result of the efforts of those individuals who drafted that legislation.

the minister knows full well that this piece of legislation not only trashes the efforts of those people, not only trashes the record of his party during the last election when it made a very simplistic promise to people in this province, a promise that it has not fulfilled or kept; at the same time, when it has acknowledged very clearly that there is a need for a comprehensive housing policy and a comprehensive housing strategy, this bill not only does not do that, this bill penalizes those tenants who had faith and confidence in this minister and in his party, which told

them one thing during the election campaign and brought them something very different following the campaign as part of this piece of legislation.

He knows as well that it has always been the position of this party that tenants' rights and tenants' interests, as I believe have been articulated extremely well by my colleague the member for Eglinton over the course of many months as this bill has been scrutinized—and as we have listened to the tenants in this province and as we have listened to the landlords in this province and as we have seen the result, which is that everything has stopped, everything has come to a complete stop. I can say to him that needed major capital work has come to a complete halt in this province because of his housing policy, or lack thereof.

Hon Mr Cooke: That is not true.

Mrs Caplan: Simply because the minister protests does not mean it is not true. It is true. To have him stand on his feet in response to my comments and impute motive, which we all know in this House is one of the tactics that he used to use in opposition, sounds more and more like he is so defensive about this policy because he knows that it is bad policy.

I can say to him that our position is one which is not only reasonable and balanced and fair, because we care about the tenants of this province. We know that they want a clean and decent place to live, and as we move forward in the debate on housing policy we ask this minister to consider an amendment that would consider the health and safety interests of those tenants. He has categorically refused to do so. On behalf of the residents of Oriole I must express my deep regret that this minister is so callous and unfeeling about the interests of my constituents.

Hon Mr Cooke: I think I get a chance to briefly respond.

The First Deputy Chair: Yes, it is just that I also like to look around and give everyone a chance. Minister, you are next.

Hon Mr Cooke: I am very interested and I think we should continue to discuss this matter with the member for Oriole, because as the time clicks on this afternoon the Liberal Party position continues to change. The critic for the Liberal Party says that the old Liberal rent review legislation under Bill 51 was not adequate, it needed changes, tenants were not adequately protected; the member for Oriole says that Bill 51 was a great piece of legislation that nobody should touch.

We should continue to discuss this because maybe by the time quarter to 6 comes, we will be able to figure out what the Liberal position is on rent review in this province. That in itself would be a major accomplishment for the Legislature, if we could figure out where the Liberals stood on protection of tenants in this province. It would be very, very interesting.

All of a sudden, when the member for Oriole gets very defensive about this issue and tries to lay out what the Liberal position is, or at least her position or at least the Liberal caucus position at 10 to 5 this afternoon—who knows what it will be at 5 or 5:10 or 5:15—she forgets the history of this legislation and Bill 51 and how weak it was

and how when tenants in this province were asking that changes take place, the former Minister of Housing, Mr Sweeney, would not even go to tenants' meetings. He would not go face tenants in this province. He sent the member for Eglinton, he sent the former member for downtown Toronto. The Minister of Housing refused to go talk to tenants. In this government, we go talk to people. We have had a consultation process and we are delivering on our commitment to improve protection for tenants.

1650

Again, I think it would be very interesting to continue having the critic for the Liberal Party and then the member for Oriole speak this afternoon, because maybe by the end of the afternoon we will be able to narrow down what the position of the Liberal Party is. The member for Oriole is leaving, so now we will listen to the Housing critic. Maybe the Housing critic can set the record straight and correct the member for Oriole.

Ms Poole: I would be delighted to set the record straight. It is unfortunate that the minister cannot seem to either listen or comprehend our position. It has been consistent since day one. Everybody else understands it except the minister, who refuses to try to understand it. From day one we said we had no problem with supporting the principle of getting rid of the outrageous rent increases, getting rid of the luxury rent increases, the luxury capital repairs, but we said we had serious concerns with this bill.

What I resent more than anything, and I resent it as a member, is that we have tried to make this legislation work. It could only have looked good for the minister if he had tried to make this legislation work. Instead, he has people out there demonstrating, picketing, calling, writing, and yet he made absolutely no effort to consider our substantive amendments.

I just cannot believe that the minister said this amendment on capital is pro-landlord. Does he think that the landlords would like a cap on capital repairs? No. Does he think they want deliberate ongoing neglect involved? No. Does he think they want quality of the repair involved? No. Does he think they want any of the provisions I have put in? That is not what they want on capital. They want to be able to spend capital as they choose, but I have chosen something deliberately modest that would continue to protect tenants and at the same time protect our housing stock.

So I resent that the minister says it is pro-landlord, particularly ironic in light of the fact that the minister has included what amounts to my amendment as one of the options in the green paper for the long term. If it is pro-landlord, what is he doing putting it in the long-term paper? I cannot conceive how the minister can actually make that accusation.

We have tried to co-operate and use goodwill in this House, but it is obvious to me that I have been somewhat naïve in thinking this minister and this government were willing to listen, willing to look at the broad picture and willing to bring in some reasonable amendments. I am very sad and disappointed. I think it is a sad day for Ontario.

Hon Mr Cooke: I appreciate the comments of the Housing critic for the Liberal Party, but she has not focused

in on what the position of the Liberal Party is. On second reading they voted in favour of Bill 4, and half of the speech that the Housing critic gave, was in favour of strict rent control and the second half was very critical of Bill 4. It was a well-constructed speech, because it could be cut in half and go to two different mailing lists.

That is the kind of position that the Liberal Party has taken on this legislation. They have said one thing to the landlords' groups and another thing to the tenants' groups and they do not think that anyone is listening. People are listening. They see that the Liberals are mixed up on this. They vote in favour of Bill 4 in principle. I mean, in the parliamentary system, Bill 4 had in it a principle of, sure, tenant protection, but it was not that wishy-washy. The principle, the guts of the bill, is a moratorium for a two-year period, a moratorium that did not have a whole bunch of loopholes and exceptions to it. That was the purpose of Bill 4 and the member knew it was the purpose of Bill 4, but the member decided to take a very political position and sit on the fence on it.

Interjection.

The First Deputy Chair: Order. Would the member for Downsview refrain from joining in debate until he is recognized. Thank you.

Hon Mr Cooke: The Liberal caucus decided to take a very political position on it. They wanted to say yes to tenants and yes to landlords. They wanted to send out that double message. It has not worked. It has caught up with them. Now we are coming to third reading on Monday. We will see where they stand on third reading on Monday. I strongly suspect that they will be voting against it. That way they can send out the voting record on second reading to tenants and they can send out the voting record on third reading to landlords. They can have it both ways, just as the Liberal Party has tried to have it for years.

Mr Sola: A few moments ago, the minister said that Bill 4 did not kill the incentive to maintain buildings or to invest in capital improvements. If he truly believes that, I would like to ask the minister, if Bill 4 did not kill the incentive to invest in capital improvements, why did he put in measures to provide public funding for capital improvements?

Up to the passage of Bill 4, the landlords themselves provided the funding to do their own capital improvements. He makes Bill 4 retroactive, all renovation dies, comes to a sudden halt, there are hundreds, maybe even thousands of people laid off and the minister has the gall to say in this House that his bill did not kill the initiative of the private investors in this province. Yet he comes up with public money to do the thing that private money was doing before his bill. How does he explain that?

Hon Mr Cooke: If you are referring to the low-rise rehabilitation program, that program was initiated by your government and there was \$80 million put into the low-rise rehab program by your government. Is that what you are referring to, the low-rise rehab program with public money—

The First Deputy Chair: Minister, I would remind you that you should direct your remarks through the Chair.

Hon Mr Cooke: Okay, I am sorry. In any case, I totally disagree with the position taken by the Liberal Party. The fact of the matter is that there still is capital being invested in apartment buildings. Most landlords in this province take the position that the \$8 billion that is paid annually in rent is supposed to provide for maintenance, and maintenance includes capital reinvestment in buildings.

The Liberal caucus will allow the landlords, under the position that it has taken, to get completely off the hook and not be responsible for capital renovations in apartment buildings. I fundamentally differ with that point of view. That is just the way it is. I fundamentally, philosophically disagree with the position that the Liberal Party is taking today now at 4:57. We will see what they say in five minutes. Maybe it will be a position that we can agree with in five minutes.

Mr Perruzza: What's their position? I want to know what their position is.

The First Deputy Chair: The member for Downsview is reminded that if he wishes to partake in this debate, he is certainly welcome to stand and be recognized. The member for Durham Centre.

Mr White: I would like to make a simple couple of points. Earlier we heard the deft repetition of the same, sodden statement that there was no further capital investment. The more often one repeats the same statement, the more it takes on a certain ingenuous reality in this House, but nowhere else.

I know in an apartment building where I have a flat there are capital investments. This is not too terribly far away from here, and yet somehow the same misstatement can occur. I am sure that the member for Oriole, who usually has a large presence in the House, has simply not researched the issue.

Mr Turnbull: You obviously haven't. You're talking drivel.

Mr White: I have, sir.

An hon member: Is she in her chair, the member for Oriole?

Mr White: I cannot speak to a member's action.

The First Deputy Chair: Order, please. The member for Durham Centre is reminded to direct his remarks through the Chair.

Mr White: Thank you, Madam Chair. I should not allow those distractions—

The First Deputy Chair: The member for Downsview is reminded once more that if he wishes to take part in debate, he may stand and be recognized.

Mr White: I want to speak first about that repetition of an inaccuracy, but the other concern which the minister mentioned was the flip-flops from the ancien régime. We know what costs investment flips have had for the tenants of this province, and at that point, a year ago, 18 months ago, eight months ago, the Liberals were all in favour of being as supportive as they could be of profits.

1700

Mr B. Murdoch: Profits, oh.

Mr Turnbull: Oh, that's awful. Profits—bad word.

Mr White: Indeed. During the election campaign, I had the opportunity of visiting a seniors' residence in my riding, and that residence—two buildings, some six storeys each, in which some hundreds of seniors lived—had been flipped on several occasions and the cost of those flips went directly to those seniors. These were people on limited incomes, and I was appalled at the way in which a new owner could translate the costs of his investments on to the backs of seniors. He knew what building he was buying. He knew who the tenants were. He also knew that he could exact his costs from those people, who had such limited income, and we had people in those buildings on fixed incomes.

Mr Stockwell: Where?

Mr White: Whitby. My apologies, Madam Chair. I should not allow myself to be distracted.

In those buildings, people were faced with retroactive rent increases of \$1,300 or \$1,400, people into their 90s, and these people spoke to me. They had previously spoken to their member, who was a member of l'ancien régime, and he very clearly stated that there was a need for profits, despite the incredible injustice which he saw in that building.

I was moved by their plight, and I spoke with all of them. We had a meeting in their building and the hall was overflowing. People were standing out into the hallways. They asked me, what would I do and what was the issue? I explained to them why this was happening to them, and one of the people there said, "Mr White, you're making a political statement," and I said: "Yes, I am. It is a political issue."

I am glad to see that our Minister of Housing so early introduced legislation to deal with their concerns and their complaints and that we will have a long-term address to the whole issue of rental properties that will address their needs so that they can live in their old age in security. It is highly improper in our society to put the elderly in a place of insecurity.

When the minister was talking about flip-flops, I think it is really remarkable. Certainly the member of the ancien régime I was faced with last summer was in strong defence of those landlords' rights to exact their capital expansion from those seniors, and the quality of their maintenance, the amount of investment in maintenance, was decreasing, not increasing, even though they were being charged more for those services. I think that it is remarkable. When we talk about apartment flips, we should talk about Liberal flip-flops; that they change from one moment to another. Where are they from one day to the next? I think that those are a significant force. I think that the people of this province know where we stand, and it is with credit.

Interjections.

The First Deputy Chair: May I remind the members that the member for Mississauga East is standing patiently, waiting for you to settle down so he may begin.

Mr Sola: I have to respond to the latest allegation of the imaginary nature of job loss and of the non-existent loss of investment in this province, because if that were the case, my colleague from Mississauga West would not have

been forced yesterday to pose an embarrassing question to the Premier about the situation of a member, an alleged member of the Premier's staff—

An hon member: Alleged is just it.

Mr Sola: That is right, but it was put in writing of an alleged member mooning people who were making protests about non-existent losses of jobs and investment. Now, is that the answer that they are going to give to the allegation that was raised in the House yesterday? If the job losses were imaginary, if the investment was imaginary, why would people be coming here with picket signs and hanging the minister in effigy and burning him in effigy and then in response getting the act that the member for Mississauga West described yesterday in question period? I would like the member to answer that.

The First Deputy Chair: Further debate? Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

All those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

The motion will be deferred until following routine proceedings on Monday.

Vote stacked.

Mr Tilson: I have a further amendment, Madam Chair.

The First Deputy Chair: Mr Tilson moves that subsection 100e(2) of the act, as set out in section 8 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clauses:

"(f) any capital expenditures that in the opinion of the minister are necessary to maintain the structural integrity of the residential complex including,

"(i) repairing or replacing delaminated concrete and steel in an underground parking garage,

"(ii) replacing a roof,

"(iii) converting the residential complex from galvanized to copper plumbing and replacing boilers,

"(iv) repairing cladding on the residential complex,

"(v) making repairs necessary to protect the safety of tenants, and

"(vi) carrying out energy conservation measures required by the Ministry of Energy;

"(g) any additional capital expenditure if at the time of contracting for that expenditure 75% of the tenants whose rent would be affected by that expenditure have consented to it in writing."

Mr Tilson: The intent of this amendment is to provide a minimum list of structural renovation and repair work that should be allowed to continue to pass through the system during the moratorium period, because clearly Bill 4 does not allow for any of that.

I believe that if you look at the items that I have just read to the committee, surely none of these items would be considered the luxury items that the Minister of Housing has referred to in the past. These are, I would submit, essential repairs that are needed to maintain the structural integrity of the buildings, the housing stock. During the committee hearings, the Ministry of Housing tabled a report that indicated that \$7 billion in 1999 dollars would be required to maintain the province's housing stock over the

next 20 years. Given that figure, the Minister of Housing knows full well that he will have to make a provision for capital in the permanent legislation.

1710

We have argued in our party that if capital is a problem today, it should be addressed in Bill 4 and not in some vague, distant time down in the future. I have submitted in the past that 80% of Ontario's housing stock was constructed prior to 1975 and all of that, through testimony we have heard at the hearings and submissions we have made in this House, is in need of repair today. If Bill 4 is passed in its present form, all of those repairs that are continually needed over time will have to wait until the moratorium period expires.

With respect to clause (g), which I have read to the committee, the intent of this clause is to allow landlords and tenants to work together. I referred in my comments yesterday to the need for partnership that this bill has done away with and I submit that clause (g) would allow the landlords and tenants to work together to agree on a capital expenditure. The democracy clause, as we call it, would help eliminate the adversarial relationship that Bill 4 has caused through the last number of months and indeed the adversarial process that perhaps had started with the implementation of Bill 51.

The Bretton Place Tenants' Association spoke out against Bill 4. They felt the bill was unfair and would jeopardize the good working relationship they had with their landlord. They were quite clear on that. I spent some time during my remarks yesterday and the day before commenting on the need to pursue the issue of repairs during the moratorium period, because that is not being done. For the Minister of Housing to stand up today and say that there are no facts presented saying that jobs will be lost and that work is being stopped, that capital expenditures are being stopped, simply is not true.

The member for Downsview has mentioned reading letters into the record. I did that for a very good reason, to illustrate examples and facts that were being presented by landlords and construction people to show that work has stopped, that jobs are being lost, and obviously that has gone unheard. We believe that this amendment, which will not entirely solve the situation and is made in the spirit of compromise, will alleviate at least some of the situations that have been referred to by our party and by members of the Liberal Party.

I would just like to refute the comments made by the Minister of Housing today that we have no facts presented, that jobs are being lost and that work has stopped. That has been made very clear, and this is just one example by a very reputable group called the Concrete Restoration Association of Ontario, which came to our committee. They said they did not represent the landlords and they did not represent the tenants. What they represented was the factor of safety.

They talked about the 80% of the buildings of this province that were built prior to 1975 and the need for repair. They said, "Bill 4 is not in the public interest," and I concur with that. I believe it has been inadvertent, which is the reason for this amendment, to solve that inadvertency

that has been put forward by the government. "Inadvertently, it imposes a risk to public safety. And even though the legislation is temporary, its effects will not be temporary." It will go beyond the moratorium period. They go into some detail of that, and I will refer to that in a few moments.

They say, "Most deterioration of concrete arises from rapid rusting of the reinforcing steel in the concrete. This is caused by the progressive accumulation of salt in the concrete itself." They go on to say that if these capital expenditures are not made, these capital improvements are not made, even during the moratorium period, these buildings will have a problem in safety. These individuals certainly are not going to be allowed, because of Bill 4, to relieve that safety problem.

They say specifically:

"No amount of major maintenance, as opposed to rehabilitation, could deal with this phenomenon. Waterproofing, without major restoration, only prevents the ingress of more salt and water but does nothing to restore the integrity of the structure.

"Because the salt-induced deterioration was not foreseen until the mid-1980s, the concrete in almost all garages contains salt and requires continuous periodic restoration or complete replacement. As well, because salt is not consumed in the corrosion process, the problem is and will remain with us throughout the service life of the building unless complete replacement occurs."

That is the problem. Because of Bill 4 this work is not being done. It is being stopped. This report is a fact and, if members have not read it, I will refer to the fact that it was an exhibit filed on 12 February 1991. It can be made available to them by any member of the government, any members who sat on that committee.

They specifically state:

"It is necessary work that must be carried out in the interest of public safety, for if it is not, garages will deteriorate and collapse. In severe situations where garages form the substructure of an apartment building, entire buildings could collapse.

"I hasten to add that to my knowledge no garages have collapsed in Ontario which have in turn caused a building to collapse. We don't want to be alarmists about this situation, but we are concerned that Bill 4 may have a detrimental effect in this regard."

That is one factor that this government has ignored, the whole issue of safety. Specifically, they talk about jobs that have been cancelled. The minister has said today that there is no evidence of jobs being cancelled. Here is a report that says the jobs are being cancelled. They go on to say why Bill 4, which is supposed to be only a temporary measure, will in fact bring lasting harm to their industry and to tenants.

"Within days of the announcement of this bill, over 42 major structural concrete restoration projects were cancelled by building owners and managers. As a consequence, 414 jobs have been lost.

"Again, I want to stress to the committee that I am not engaging in idle rhetoric. I have read reports of some who have questioned the job loss figures associated with the

legislation, saying that the figures were overstated or due to the recession. That simply is not the case. These needed repair jobs were cancelled and these needed jobs were lost as a direct result of Bill 4."

There is one example of facts. There are dozens and dozens of other reports given to us to show that contracts were cancelled that were planned for needed capital improvements to our housing industry, and I challenge the Minister of Housing to refute that.

Mr Callahan: I would like to relate something to the members. I am certainly a tenants person. I believe that tenants in this high cost of housing have to be protected—

Hon Mr Philip: Did you say "tenants person" or "tense person"?

Mr Callahan: We have a landlord speaking to us right now who is probably going to have difficulty in voting on this bill, the Minister of Transportation.

Hon Mr Philip: I have always looked out for the tenants. That is more than you have done in your career.

The Chair: Order.

Mr Callahan: But I have to say it is nice to see the member in the House, and before he got involved—

Interjections.

The Chair: The member for Brampton South, would you please take your seat. Order. The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, would you please refrain from—

Mr Callahan: I had no intentions of being partisan, as the Minister of Housing always accuses me of being, but my ire was upset by the landlord over there, the Minister of Transportation, who probably has more housing units than most of the people in this entire House.

Hon Mr Philip: I created more housing units than the member's government created.

Mr Callahan: The member certainly did and I wonder how he is going to vote.

1720

Hon Mr Philip: That says something for your housing policy.

The Chair: Order. The member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, if you want to debate—

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. I would remind the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale that if you want to debate, all you have to do is to stand up and I will recognize you. The member for Brampton South.

Mr Callahan: I will try to restrain myself.

I wanted to relate to the House that, as I said before, I am a tenants' person. I believe that tenants, particularly in this time of restraint, this time of high cost of housing, have to be protected.

The former Conservative Party brought in rent control. We have now created a system where people do not want high increases. They cannot afford the high increases. Since we have that system in place, I am in favour of the fact that the tenants should be protected. That part of the bill, in a sense, I can live with. But I find it really difficult to accept the fact that the new NDP government that pur-

ports to be terribly democratic, and so many of them over there own rental properties.

Hon Mrs Grier: So many!

Mr Callahan: Well, we have not found out whether the Minister of the Environment has any yet or not.

Hon Mr Philip: Not all of us got our money from our daddy.

Mr Callahan: The Minister of Transportation is extremely vocal today. I guess he just got his rent rebate or something.

I would like to say that I can speak to members of the personal experience of my mother, who is now 86 years of age. She lived in what in New York was called a rent-controlled building. At that time, the government of the day—and I cannot remember which government it was—decided to introduce the exact draconian measures that are being introduced by this Minister of Housing, disallowing any possible repair pass-throughs at all. I can tell members, from personal attendance at that building, that it went from being a very delightful building to one that you could only read about in *Bonfire of the Vanities*. If members have not read *Bonfire of the Vanities*, about the south Bronx of the United States, they better read it. I am going to send that to my mother, I say to the Minister of Transportation, and he will be in trouble. She loves to write politicians.

I want to say that the bill itself, in terms of keeping rents at a reasonable rate, particularly in this time of high economic pressures, is very important. It is very important to me personally, and it should be very important to people in this House personally, that with the high cost of housing, our children will have grave difficulty in trying to find a place to live.

As I said to the Minister of Housing—and he accused me of being political—as we walk through Toronto and see people sleeping on the streets of this city, it is a direct indictment of the fact that we have failed to try to find a way to deal with the question of housing in this province. Not just in this province but in this country.

I can speak in favour, to a limited degree, of the amendments that are being introduced by the opposition or the third party at the moment. I far prefer those that were put forward by the critic from this party in terms of trying to accommodate, to have a middle-of-the-road approach. It is really not a different approach. It is a similar approach to that of the former Housing minister, Mr Sweeney, who tried to say that landlords should not be able to introduce maintenance that is not needed, that is just being done for purposes of gouging or increasing the value or the cost to the tenants, but is something that must be necessary. He gave a degree of democratic freedom to them to decide whether they wished to have those improvements made.

I suggest to members that the Minister of Housing may feel that by this bill by eliminating the question of pass-through, it is going to be a great political coup. It will have a temporary degree of relief. Tenants will see that as a panacea, as something that is protecting them, but in the final analysis, when they realize that their buildings have

ecome slums, that many of the needed repairs are not being done, they will then suddenly realize that this particular bill, Bill 4 as it presently stands without amendment, is nothing more than a sheer, nasty, ill-founded political trick, one that promises a whole host of good things for the people of this province and in essence is nothing more than a hot balloon that will soon burst.

I am sure there are many members in the New Democratic Party, and some I know, who are probably feeling very uncomfortable about this whole process, because they are people of good faith; they are people who care about tenants. They see their government trying to ramrod through what is nothing more than a political attempt to gain votes and has nothing to do with caring about individuals. If they cared, they would look at the long-range program. They would look at not today, but four years or five years down the line, at what is going to happen to this building. Because they have in fact taken away from the small landlords—and there are many of them—the opportunity to look after their apartments.

I was not on this committee, but I can recall previous committees where we had people who did not take advantage of the rent review process. They in fact charged lower rents to their tenants because they felt they owed them. They cared about people. They cared about people, and I think that their actions in that regard are a demonstration of light-years over the political platitudes that the NDP government is now trying to introduce by sort of concretizing over the whole issue.

I would think that the caring people in the NDP caucus would say to the Minister of Housing, "Sorry, it may be a political promise, it may be something that you think is politically sexy, but we are looking at the long-range aspect." That is one of the problems, I think, in politics today, the fact that we do not look at the long-range aspects. It is always the quick fix, the quick gratification, as opposed to what we are doing for the people down the line.

We have had a lot of conversation in this House about Tory-battering, about the Prime Minister and the fact that he entered into a free trade agreement which will destroy this country, and yet this government is doing exactly the same thing in the long range. It is so shortsighted that it is in fact taking this province down the road towards more people being out of housing, more people moving out of dilapidated housing because it is not being repaired by the landlords, more bankruptcies for small landlords, more jobs being lost. Members saw them outside the Legislature. Unfortunately, they left when they got mooned, but members saw them outside the Legislature: workers. This government supposedly supports the workers.

The Chair: Order, please. I do not know that what you are talking about has anything to do with the motion.

Mr Callahan: It has to do with the capital aspect of it.

The Chair: I would ask you to debate—

Mr Callahan: I will return, Mr Chairman. I will talk about capital.

Mr Tilson: I understand you.

Mr Callahan: Does the member understand? The member for Dufferin-Peel says—well, thank you, Mr Chairman, for bringing me back to the topic.

What this government is doing is for the quick fix, the quick political expediency of capping rents, which I agree with. I do not agree with it voluntarily, but I agree with it because this government and the third party—the member for Dufferin-Peel will not like that—set this in place. They have created a comfortable pew, a warmth of the womb for those people who now have a place to live and do not have to live on the streets. We have to continue that, and I favour that. I support that. I think every member of my caucus supports that.

But when they start talking about, "That is it, nothing more, you do not get anything extra," they are in fact creating a scenario that will result in dilapidation, in removal of landlords from the community. This government will actually be decreasing housing as opposed to increasing it. If there is anything we need today, it is increased affordable housing.

1730

Mr Mills: Right on.

Mr Callahan: Right on. The member opposite, whom I have great respect for—and I cannot remember his riding, has said, "Right on," and I agree with that. He is now being visited by the Minister of Housing, who is going to tell him to cool it. There is a man who is caring. The member for Durham East is caring. Every time we hear him speak in the House he is caring. He understands this issue. He understands that we are looking at the quick fix as opposed to the long-term solution.

If there is one thing that the last election told us, and it told us in spades, it was the fact that the people out there, the people we should be caring about, the people of this community—and the Minister of Housing should not look at me—voted definitively in terms of politicians looking at the long-range aspect. I think the minister is making a very grave mistake in just looking at the quick fix.

He has to keep in mind that many of these accommodations, as was described by many of my colleagues, are buildings that perhaps are 10, 15, 20, 30 years of age. If they do not continue to look after them, if they eliminate the potential for doing that and force the small landlords, particularly seniors—I have heard in this House that on the committee seniors came forward, seniors who invested in these properties.

Seniors are the finest people we will ever have in this country. They care. They are not just interested in the buck because they know that down the line that is not the most important thing. They care about people, they care about housing the young. I am sure that they are excited, or "overwhelmed" perhaps is a better word, by the fact that there are young people in Metro Toronto who are down here living away from their homes, not being able to afford anything, living in hostels.

We are not saying to them: "We're going to create a better environment for you. We're going to create housing that you can afford." We are saying: "You're going to live in dilapidated conditions. We're going to put people out of

work." Maybe some of those young people work part- or full-time for repairers; maybe they work part- or full-time for suppliers. They are going to be out of jobs.

The New Democratic Party that supposedly stands for the labour movement and for caring and all that good stuff—and many of them are now just sort of sitting around and having private conversations because this is really a ho-hum issue. It is not important. The member for Durham East is listening, I am glad to see, but many of the members of the government, who I would think would be sitting on the edges of their chairs listening to this debate, are just wandering around doing nothing, having private stories and jokes. I find that really bothers me. That is not political stuff. It bothers me that the most critical issue, housing, which is—

The Chair: Order, please. If you want to hold conversations, please hold them outside the House. I can hardly hear what goes on. Thank you. Would the member for Downsview take his seat, please? The member for Durham Centre, the member for Etobicoke-Rexdale, would you please take your seats? Thank you.

Mr Callahan: Thank you very much for calling the members to order.

The Chair: Please debate the motion.

Mr Callahan: I think that capital is such an important aspect that we have to stay on the topic, and I really appreciate your calling the members of the government back to order. As I say, they find this may be boring, that members of the opposition would try to discuss some of the major social issues of this time.

The Minister of Housing says—and I guess we have to take him at his word, and I do because all members of this House are honourable people—on his green paper that he will address this issue at some point down the line, but it is kind of like someone coming up to you and saying: "Trust me. If you vote for this, I will enlarge the whole scenario afterwards. Trust me." As I say, because he is an honourable member of the Legislature, I do trust him.

But I can assure members that I, my colleagues of the official opposition and, I am sure, the third party, if that minister, when that green paper has been discussed, comes back with nothing and says: "Aha, I gotcha, you voted for or against the capitation of rents. There is going to be no further bill. That is it. We've got our bill to go to the people on the next occasion and put everybody down"—if the minister does that, he can be sure that he will—

Hon Mr Cooke: Do not be so silly. The member has not even read the bill. It expires in two years.

Mr Callahan: He is saying, "Do not be so silly." Why is the minister saying it is silly?

The Chair: Order.

Mr Callahan: Sorry, Mr Chair. All right, I am just saying in finality, and I am going to close with this—

Mr O'Connor: Good.

Mr Callahan: Somebody said, "Good." All right, it is very light-hearted over there. They think this. But when this comes to the floor of this House, if the minister does not stay to his word, he can be sure that it will be read

back to him from Hansard what I have said and what others have said in terms of the trust we put in him that the matter will be dealt with down the line.

Hon Mr Cooke: I would like to just very briefly respond to the member. I think my colleagues in the government caucus will understand exactly what I was talking about a few minutes ago, now that they have heard another member of the Liberal caucus. Members would almost think from the way the member who just spoke has spoken for the last few minutes that they voted against Bill 4 on second reading, but they voted in favour of it. In fact, that member voted in favour of it.

Talk about the tradition of the Liberal Party. Obviously the tradition of the Liberal Party is coming home to roost. They want to have it both ways. They always have wanted to have it both ways. They have absolutely no principle when it comes to an issue as fundamental as tenants' rights.

Mr Callahan: On a point of privilege, Mr Chair: The Minister of Housing has been in this House long enough to realize that on second reading, in order to get the matter to committee, in order to deal with it by way of amendment, it is not untraditional for the party to vote for it. That does not necessarily mean that they agree with it and he knows it. He should not be telling the people of this province things that he knows are untrue.

The Chair: Order, please. Would you please retract that word "untrue"? It leads to believe that you are saying something else.

Mr Callahan: I will not retract it, because the Minister of Housing knows exactly what the issue is and he knows exactly what he is saying is untrue.

The Chair: I will ask you again, please, to answer my request.

Mr Callahan: He is at least prevaricating.

The Chair: I have asked you to withdraw the word. You say that the minister—I do not have to repeat. You know what I am saying.

Mr Callahan: All right. I will retract it as long as he clarifies for those who are watching what the situation is.

The Chair: Order, please. The member for Brampton South, would you please retract the word so that I can hear you well.

Mr Callahan: I thought I had, Mr Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Hon Mr Cooke: May I complete my very brief comments, Mr Chair? The other point that I would like to make—on the inconsistencies of the Liberal caucus I think that point has been made. I would ask the Liberal Housing critic, who was rather agitated a few minutes ago that I was talking about their inconsistency, that she might want to take a look at the comments that her colleague has made in the last few minutes and understand why I and the members of my caucus are so absolutely confused about the position the Liberal Party has taken.

I will give the Tory Party full credit. They take a very clear position on this: eliminate rent controls; let tenants go unprotected. That is the position the Tories have taken

or a long time and it is a position I understand. But the Liberal Party, I have no idea where it stands on this issue and it is because members like the member for Brampton South speaks out differently than the member who is the Housing critic.

One final point: The member who was just speaking was referring to his mother and the experience in New York when it brought in similar types of legislation a few years ago, like we have. The New York legislation was brought in in 1947. I do not know how he can remember. Maybe he is older than I think he is, but I do not believe that he is and he might want to learn a little bit more about the New York situation before he quotes what happened some 43 years ago. That legislation was brought in 43 years ago. I am not sure, I guess the rhetoric that he wants to use in the Legislature is fine on this type of legislation, but the fact of the matter is, he did not know what he was talking about.

740

Mr Mahoney: I would like to address the amendment actually, which might be a novel thing in here, but I would like to address that amendment and ask the minister a couple of questions. First of all, the former speaker, I have not on good authority, was at least 14 years old in 1947. It is hard to believe, he is so young and agile and youthful and quick-witted, but he was.

The amendment deals, however, with a statement that—to the minister, if I could ask for a response, and could I ask him not to respond by reminding me how I voted. I know how I voted and I can guarantee I am not voting that way when it comes to third reading.

Hon Mr Cooke: Flip-flop.

Mr Mahoney: He can take whatever he wants out of it. I have examined it and have clearly decided that this is a bad bill that is flawed and I have no intention of supporting it on third reading.

Hon Mr Cooke: Flip-flop.

Mr Mahoney: If he wants to call it that, he is the government. We are criticizing his bill. If he wants to spend his time criticizing the opposition, well, he can go ahead. I have a thick skin. There is not too much he can say that will bother me.

I would like a position though, because the amendment put forward by the third party says that the amendment it wants is that certain things be allowed if, in the opinion of the minister, they are deemed necessary—and this is very key and very important—“to maintain the structural integrity of the residential complex.” They include a number of things.

I heard the minister at a committee with very moist eyes describing a group of senior citizens in his riding in Windsor who were concerned. They were going to jump off the balcony, was what he said, if the rents went up. I have pointed out in this House before, now they are going to fall off the balcony because the minister is not going to take a look at any necessary repairs.

It says here, “In the opinion of the minister...to maintain the structural integrity,” he would approve the repair-

ing or replacing of dilapidated concrete and steel in an underground parking garage.

I would ask the minister straightforwardly why he will not accept the responsibility to examine a request for that kind of capital repair and why he would not look at a particular specific problem. What is he prepared to tell them to do if indeed, as with many examples that we saw brought before the committee, we saw garages that were falling down, concrete that was falling down, structural steel that was in danger, that was rusted? This simply says that if, in his opinion, the structural integrity would be damaged, he would approve that repair. Why will he not do that? I am asking a question.

Hon Mr Cooke: I remember the question very well because the same question was asked in committee. I believe very strongly that the structural problems that exist in the apartment units in the province did not happen all on 28 November of last year. It has always been a little bit surprising to me that all of a sudden parking garages and electrical work and so forth needed to be done on 28 November, when I introduced Bill 4.

It seems to me that there is \$8 billion worth of rent being paid in this province by tenants and that it is not appropriate for him and his caucus to let landlords off the hook by saying that any capital expenditures have to go through the rent review system and have to result in higher rents. We believe that there is a responsibility, out of the \$8 billion that is currently paid in rent, for capital to be expended in this province.

The Chair: Order. Pursuant to the time allocation order passed by the House this afternoon, I must interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of all remaining sections of the bill and the remaining amendments, which are deemed to be moved according to the time allocation order.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Chair: It may not have been moved as an amendment to the motion, but it had been agreed among all of us that the votes for committee of the whole would be stacked for voting on Monday following routine proceedings—in fact, the Orders and Notices has been put in place to allow that to happen—and that in fact we would go fully to 6 of the clock this evening, then ask the committee to rise and report and again resume, to have the stacked votes taken on Monday following routine proceedings.

The Chair: I agree partly with what you say, except that I have to put the question for all amendments that have been presented, and the vote will take place on Monday.

Hon Mr Cooke: All the other amendments that have been tabled.

The Chair: That is correct.

Member for Mississauga South, I have to bring in the amendments now. Was it a point of order, or what was it?

Mrs Marland: It was not a point of order. I wish to take part in the debate.

The Chair: Let's follow the procedure.

We will deal first with the amendment moved by the member for Dufferin-Peel, section 9 of the bill, section

100e. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: Motion introduced by the Liberals, section 9 of the bill, clause 100e(2)(g): Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

Ms Poole: Particularly this amendment, I would like it read out in full.

The Chair: It has been deemed to have been moved by the member for Eglinton that subsection 100e(2) of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clause:

"(g) any capital expenditure no longer borne in an amount up to the amount that was allowed in a previous order under this act or the Residential Tenancies Act."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

Mrs Marland: Are we indicating that we will have a recorded vote on each amendment?

Hon Mr Cooke: That is right. It is taken care of.

The Chair: It has been deemed that section 9 of the bill, clause 100e of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clause—

Some hon members: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that subsection 100e of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clause—

Some hon members: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

1750

The Chair: We will now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that subsection 100e(2) of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following clause:

"(i) subject to subsection (8a), costs for capital expenditures incurred by the landlord of a mobile home park as the result of an order or a request of the Ministry of the Environment or the municipality."

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: A motion introduced by the Liberals: It has been deemed to have been moved that section 100e of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsections:

"(8a) The minister may disallow part or all of any capital expenditures under clause (2)(f) that, in his or her opinion, were required as a result of the ongoing, deliberate neglect of maintenance and repair of the residential complex.

"(8b) The minister shall consider evidence submitted as to the quality and value of money of the repair, replacement or renovation when determining the amount of the increase under clause (2)(f).

"(8c) The maximum amount the minister may allow in a determination under clause (2)(f) is 5% of the gross potential rent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We shall now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 100(e) of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by adding the following subsection:

"(8a) The minister shall allow in each year an amount under clause (2)(i) that equals the total capital expenditures amortized over 15 years in the form of an equal annual payment."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Liberal motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following section to the act:

"100ga(1) This section applies to all work orders against a residential complex that have been filed by a municipality with the standards board and that are outstanding on or after the day that is 30 days after the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent.

"(2) If, in the opinion of the standards board, the subject matter of a work order affects the structural soundness of the residential complex or the health or safety of its tenants, the standards board shall give written notice to the landlord informing the landlord,

"(a) that the work order is outstanding;

"(b) that if the landlord does not make reasonable efforts to comply with the work order within 30 days of the date of the notice, the standards board will notify all affected tenants of that fact; and

"(c) that upon receiving notice under clause (b), the tenants will have the right to withhold that portion of rent equal to the percentage increases permitted under subsection 71(1) until the standards board is satisfied that the landlord is making reasonable efforts to comply with the work order.

"(3) If the landlord does not make reasonable efforts to comply with the work order within 30 days of the date of the notice, the standards board shall forthwith notify all affected tenants of their rights under subsection (4).

"(4) A tenant may withhold that portion of rent equal to the percentage increase permitted under subsection 71(1) if he or she has received a notice from the standards board that the landlord has not made reasonable efforts to comply with the work order and may continue to do so until the standards board notifies the tenant otherwise.

"(5) Upon receiving satisfactory evidence that the landlord is making reasonable efforts to comply with the work order, the standards board shall forthwith notify all affected tenants that it has received that evidence and that they may no longer withhold the portion of their rent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following section to the act:

"100ia. Section 91 applies with necessary modifications in respect of chronically depressed rent as if an application made under section 74 were an application made under section 100d and an order made under subsection 33(1) were an order made respecting an application under section 100d."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Liberal motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 100n of the act—

Ms Poole: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Chairman: There are some members of the New Democratic Party who are voting who are not in their seats.

Hon Mr Cooke: What about Chris?

Mr Stockwell: I'm not voting.

Mrs Marland: He is not voting.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order. It is a voice vote.

Mrs Marland: Mr Chairman, I suggest, with respect, that members in this House, whether they are standing to vote or it is a voice vote, have to be in their seats. We have at least seven members of the New Democratic Party government at this point who are voting who are not in their seats.

The Chair: It is a voice vote and the ruling has been made.

Interjections.

The Chair: Order, please. It is a voice vote and the ruling has been made.

We will now proceed with a Liberal motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 100n of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill—

Hon Mr Cooke: Dispense.

The Chair: Dispense. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Progressive Conservative motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 100n of the act, as set out in section 9 of the bill, be amended by striking out "1 October 1990" wherever it occurs and substituting in each case "the day the Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991 receives royal assent."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Liberal motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following section to the act:

"100ta(1) In this section, 'economic eviction' in respect of a tenant occurs when the tenant is forced to discontinue a residential tenancy because of a rent increase that the tenant cannot reasonably afford to pay.

"(2) The minister shall, within 30 days of being asked to do so by a tenant, give the tenant priority on the waiting list for housing provided by the Ontario Housing Corp if, in the opinion of the minister, the tenant has experienced economic eviction.

"(3) The minister shall, within 30 days of being asked to do so by a tenant, make reasonable efforts to ensure that the tenant is given priority on waiting lists for co-operative housing and any other non-profit rent-gear-to-income housing other than that provided by the Ontario Housing Corp if, in the opinion of the minister, the tenant has experienced economic eviction."

Is it the pleasure of the committee that the motion carry?

All those in favour of the motion will please say "aye".

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

The Chair: We will now deal with a Liberal motion, the last motion. It has been deemed to have been moved that section 9 of the bill be amended by adding the following section to the act:

"100tb(1) In this section, 'economic eviction' in respect of a tenant occurs when the tenant is forced to discontinue a residential tenancy because of a rent increase that the tenant cannot reasonably afford to pay.

"(2) If, in the opinion of the minister, a tenant has experienced economic eviction, the minister shall, within 60 days of being asked to do so by the tenant, provide the tenant with a comparable rental unit at a price the tenant can afford."

All those in favour will please say "aye".

All those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the nays have it.

Vote stacked.

Sections 10 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

On motion by Mr Cooke, the committee reported progress.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Cooke: In the absence of the House leader, I would like to report to the House on the business for next week:

On Monday 22 April we will have the deferred decisions on Bill 4 that have been put off till that day. That will be followed by third reading of Bill 4 and a vote at 5:45.

Tuesday 23 April is an opposition day standing in the name of the member for Nipissing.

On Wednesday 24 April we will have debate on a motion for interim supply covering a three-month period commencing 1 May 1991.

On Thursday 25 April government business in the afternoon will be debate on concurrences in estimates concerning the estimates of the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of the Environment.

On Thursday morning will be private members' hour, ballot item 13, standing in the name of the member for Simcoe Centre, and ballot item 14, standing in the name of the member for Halton Centre.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Haslam): Before we leave, I think it is nice to end on a pleasant note. I know we have thanked the pages, but I would ask you once again to thank the pages for their five weeks here with us.

[Applause]

The House adjourned at 1805.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Hon Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	Minister of Health
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haack, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Government Services, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
ffer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
wens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
erruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
hilip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
hillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
ilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
irier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
bole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
ouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
ae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
amsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
izzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
unciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
uprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
cott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
lipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
ola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
orbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
erling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
ockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
ullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
utherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
warbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
ilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
urnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
illeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
'ard, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
'ard, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
'ark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
'arner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
'aters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
'essenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
'hite, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
'ildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
'ilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Correctional Services
'ilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
'ilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
'inninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
'iseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
'itmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward

Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson

Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Vacant

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Peter Kormos, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood

Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 18 April 1991

Private members' public business

Intervenor Funding Project Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 39	.795
Mr Chiarelli	.795
Mr McLean	.796
Ms Carter	.797
Mr Harnick	.797
Mrs Caplan	.798
Mr Arnott	.798
Mr McGuinty	.799
Mr B. Murdoch	.800
Mr Silipo	.800
Negatived	.807
Electrical Wiring Systems Act, 1991, Bill 67	.801
Mr Jordan	.801
Mr Offer	.802
Mr McLean	.803
Ms Carter	.804
Mr Arnott	.805
Mr Huget	.806
Mr B. Murdoch	.806
Mrs Haslam	.806
Mr Mills	.807
Negatived	.808

Members' statements

Oath of allegiance	.809
Mr H. O'Neil	
Shelter for women	.809
Mr Carr	
Catharines Standard	.809
Ms Haeck	
Cross-border shopping	.809
Mr Cleary	
Flooding	.810
Mr McLean	
Fish and wildlife management	.810
Mr McLean	
Parent-teacher associations	.810
Mrs MacKinnon	
Child care	.810
Mrs McLeod	
Social assistance	.810
Mr Jackson	
Flooding	.811
Mr Drainville	

Statements by the ministry

Advocacy and guardianship	.812
Ms Ziemba	
Forestry audit	.812
Mr Wildman	

National Consumer Week	.813
Ms Churley	

Responses

Advocacy and guardianship	.813
Mr Mahoney	
National Consumer Week	.814
Mr Mahoney	
Forestry audit	.814
Mr Ramsay	
Advocacy and guardianship	.814
Mr Curling	
Mrs Marland	
Forestry audit	.815
Mr McLean	
National Consumer Week	.815
Mr Jackson	

Oral questions

Nursing salaries	.816
Mr Phillips	
Ms Gigantes	
Conflict of interest	.817
Mr Scott	
Mr Rae	
Oath of allegiance	.818
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
Cross-border shopping	.818
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
Conflict of interest	.819
Mr Offer	
Mr Rae	
Health insurance	.819
Mr Eves	
Ms Gigantes	
Ontario produce	.820
Mr Abel	
Mr Buchanan	
Hazardous waste	.821
Mrs Sullivan	
Mrs Grier	
School board strike	.822
Mr Villeneuve	
Mrs Boyd	
Child care	.822
Mr Hansen	
Mrs Boyd	
Flooding	.822
Mr Ramsay	
Mr Wildman	

Education financing	823
Mrs Cunningham	
Mrs Boyd	
Succession duties	823
Mr Owens	
Mr Laughren	
Social work	824
Mrs McLeod	
Ms Akande	
Health insurance	824
Mr Sterling	
Mr Farnan	

Petitions

School curriculum	825
Mrs Marland	
Social assistance	825
Mr Tilson	

First readings

Eastern Pentecostal Bible College Act, 1991,	
Bill Pr37	825
Mr Sutherland	
Agreed to	825
Advocacy Act, 1991, Bill 74	825
Ms Ziemba	
Agreed to	825

Government motion

Time allocation, motion 16	825
Miss Martel	825
Agreed to	825

Committee of the whole House

Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991,	
Bill 4	826
Mr Tilson	827
Mr Cooke	827
Mr Turnbull	828

Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act (continued)	
Ms Poole	830
Mrs Caplan	832
Mr Sorbara	835
Mr White	835
Mr Callahan	838
Mr Mahoney	841
Progress reported	844

Other business

Oath of allegiance	811
The Speaker	
Question period	811
The Speaker	
Budget	813
Mr Laughren	
Ministerial statements	813
Mr Chiarelli	
Members' mailings	815
Mr Elston	
Miss Martel	
Health insurance	820
Ms Gigantes	
Mr Elston	
Mr Eves	
Rent regulation	825
Mr Curling	
Israeli independence commemoration	826
Mr Kwinter	
Mr Rae	
Mr Harnick	
Legislative pages	826
Ms Poole	
Mr Kormos	
Business of the House	844
Mr Cooke	
Adjournment	844

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	845
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	848

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 18 avril 1991

Affaires d'intérêt public émanant de simples députés

Loi de 1990 modifiant la Loi sur le projet d'aide financière	
aux intervenants, projet de loi 39	795
M. Chiarelli	795
Rejetée	807
Loi de 1991 sur les installations électriques,	
projet de loi 67	801
M. Jordan	801
Rejetée	808

Première lecture

Loi de 1990 sur l'intervention, projet de loi 74	825
Mme Ziemba	
Adoptée	825

A2 ON
X1
223



20 1991

20 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 22 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 22 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 22 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

LEGISLATIVE PAGES

The Speaker: I would ask all members to join me in welcoming the third group of pages to serve in the First Session of the 35th Parliament:

Christopher Bardon, Mississauga North; Njeri Campbell, Etobicoke-Rexdale; Thomas Castaldo, Oshawa; Ryan Christie, Simcoe Centre; Andrea Dadamo, Windsor-Sandwich; Joseph de los Reyes, Scarborough-Agincourt; James Evans, Beaches-Woodbine; Virginia Greer, Timiskaming; David Guest, Leeds-Grenville; David Han, York Centre; Naomi Johnson, Simcoe West; Sarah Lambert, Kingston and The Islands; Larry Leung, Wilson Heights; Keith MacDonald, Perth; Monte McNaughton, Middlesex; Nikisha Reyes-Grange, Durham West; Michelle Roche, Lincoln; Andrea Sackaney, Niagara Falls; Erica Sanderson, Brampton South; Peter Smiechowski, Parkdale; Eric Tam, York Mills; Janet Taylor, Parry Sound; Katherine Telford, York South; Sandra Wilson, Ottawa West.

Would you welcome them to our chamber.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

JAMES HAMMOND SR

Mr Offer: I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the 1991 Mississauga Citizen of the Year recipient, James Hammond, Sr.

Mr Hammond received the Gordon S. Shipp Memorial Award in recognition of his extensive work spanning four decades. A father of five, this year's recipient has volunteered his time and talents on behalf of many local organizations, including the Streetsville Lions Club, St Joseph's school and church, Streetsville Musicorps and Royal Canadian Legion. James Hammond Sr, a Streetsville resident, also served for many years as a volunteer firefighter for the Streetsville fire department.

I think all members of the House are well aware of the great contribution made by volunteers in our communities. These individuals give tirelessly of themselves, contributing in no small measure to the betterment of the areas we represent.

James Hammond Sr is one such individual receiving a very prestigious award in the city of Mississauga, but he is by no means the only one. Each community has individuals who share in the commitment of a James Hammond Sr. Indeed, as well as with Mr Hammond, awards were presented to three additional outstanding volunteers: Sherry Lee was recognized for her contribution in a variety of organizations, and Ethel and Harold Taylor were also recognized.

It is individuals such as these who make this province an example for others to follow.

ST GREGORY SEPARATE SCHOOL

Mr Stockwell: I rise today to bring to the attention of the Minister of Education a very serious situation in my riding. St Gregory's separate school in Etobicoke is in need of immediate renovation and expansion to meet the demands of increasing enrolment.

I would like to welcome some of the representatives from St Gregory's school to the Ontario Legislature today who join us in the members' gallery. They have been petitioning the Metropolitan Separate School Board for funding for these much-needed renovations since 1982 and had felt that their hard work and patience had finally paid off when they achieved the number two position on the priority list for funds in 1992. However, under new government guidelines, lists have been combined and have bumped St Gregory's to number six.

I personally visited St Gregory's school and saw at first hand the lack of facilities and overcrowded conditions of the school. For example: Two small sets of washrooms have to serve the entire student body. The undersized gymnasium, which doubles as an assembly room, barely holds one gym class, let alone the entire student body. Change rooms have to be used for storage, which leaves little or no room for their intended use. A storage closet has been converted to the French teacher's office.

The parents and staff at St Gregory's feel that the lack of adequate space is seriously jeopardizing the quality of education of the children. The students have suffered long enough and the parents and staff have been more than patient. However, their patience has now turned to frustration. They feel cheated, and rightly so.

I strongly urge the Minister of Education to take immediate action on their behalf to remedy this inequitable situation and to put St Gregory's school back to its rightful position for funding on the priority list.

WATERFRONT TRAIL

Mr White: It gives me great pleasure to rise and offer comment upon the initiation of a Lakeshore Greenway, a waterfront trail from Burlington to Bowmanville.

On Saturday, a meeting was held at Ontario Place which was truly in the spirit of Earth Day. It was entitled How to Achieve the Greening of the Waterfront and was introduced by David Crombie, commissioner, Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront, and the minister responsible for the greater Toronto area.

A Waterfront Trail Membership Association, made up of citizens' groups, outdoors associations and volunteers, was established at this meeting to help implement the Ontario government-endorsed Watershed report recommendation of a continuous waterfront trail linking the GTA along its entire waterfront. The trail will be consistent with the Watershed principles of clean, green, usable, diverse, open, accessible, connected, affordable and attractive lands.

As a former presenter on these very issues before the royal commission, I find the establishment of the waterfront trail to be very exciting. It will encourage the formation of trails and greenways linking a province-wide network.

1340

ERINDALE CAMPUS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

Mr Mahoney: The Erindale campus of the University of Toronto is located in my riding of Mississauga West.

Since its founding in 1967, Erindale has made a significant impact on the community of Mississauga. Not only does it provide educational opportunities for our citizens of Mississauga and its environs, but the economic and cultural benefits to the community are considerable.

Erindale has an operating budget in excess of \$35 million and employs more than 600 full- and part-time staff. As well, more than 300 part-time positions are available within the college to students. Five hundred of these employees are Mississauga residents and they generate over \$18 million in direct spending in our community. Students of course spend another \$7 million annually. Major construction and maintenance projects together with the purchase of supplies amount to an additional \$2.2 million a year.

The former Liberal government recognized the valuable contributions of Erindale College educationally, culturally and economically and subsequently supported the college through its programs.

I am asking for assurance and I hope that this NDP government will continue to support this very important institution in Mississauga at the same generous levels as did the former Liberal government.

EASTERN ONTARIO

Mr Jordan: The government of Ontario has long ignored the needs of eastern Ontario. Like the Liberal government before it, the NDP government has done nothing for the eastern part of this province.

With the resignation of the Ottawa-Centre MPP last Thursday, eastern Ontario has only one cabinet minister, the member for Frontenac-Addington, whom I sincerely congratulate.

Lanark-Renfrew, the riding I represent, along with ridings in the east, needs to attract this government's attention. We need special assistance to get our message into cabinet.

While other parts of the province, like northern Ontario and the greater Toronto area, have ministers representing special interests, eastern Ontario has nothing.

This government should know that the town of Renfrew has lost 1,200 jobs in the past six years. It should realize that Smiths Falls, Carleton Place, Perth and Almonte have been devastated by factory closures. Who will help us provide much-needed industrial incentives to eastern Ontario?

The government should appoint a deputy minister for eastern Ontario, set up a cabinet committee to discover the province does not end at Belleville and treat eastern On-

tario with the care and respect now given the greater Toronto area.

EARTH DAY

Mr Hayes: Yesterday, I had the opportunity to participate, with two of my sons, Michael and James, in Earth Day activities at the home of Greta and Keith Thompson, residents of the Essex-Kent riding.

Mr and Mrs Thompson have a beautiful piece of property with hundreds of trees, plants and flowers. They have donated many years to not only the survival but also the propagation of more than 30 species of rare Carolinian trees.

To celebrate Earth Day, they opened up their home to local residents, giving away hundreds of seedling trees to the young people in the area. The day's activities also included pottery demonstrations using the clay found throughout Kent county.

The Thompsons not only gave me a 12-foot silver maple, which is now planted on my lawn; they also asked that I present the Minister of the Environment with an 8-foot silver oak to thank her for her dedication towards a cleaner environment. The white oak is a symbol of strength. You can cut it down, but the roots will not let go.

Although the rules of the House would not allow me to bring the tree in, I ask the minister, on behalf of the Thompsons, to accept the silver oak for planting in her residence, Queen's Park or a place of her preference.

DONATION OF MEDICATION

Mr Henderson: Many honourable members will share my sense of the tragedy of suffering and poverty in Third World nations. Two Ontario-based, Canadian-owned pharmaceutical manufacturers have made a significant contribution to the alleviation of shortage and suffering in Third World Latin America through a donation of medications with a value of about \$20,000.

Members will know that Latin American nations are reaching very actively to develop stronger economic trade, cultural and other ties with Ontario and Canada. Besides satisfying our altruistic wish to help disadvantaged peoples, expanded ties can benefit Ontario as well. Since the United States is pursuing a trade deal with Mexico that many feel will disadvantage some important Canadian industries, there is a real opportunity for Ontarians to seize the initiative in broadening our interchange with Latin America.

The generosity of these two Canadian pharmaceutical manufacturers helps strengthen the climate of trust which must underlie such expanded commerce. Especially, I want to applaud and salute the generosity of Leslie Dan of NovoPharm Ltd and Bernard Sherman of Apotex Pharmaceuticals. These two outstanding Ontario companies have demonstrated compassion, sensitivity and excellent corporate citizenship. We appreciate it.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr Jackson: I call the attention of the House to the current funding crisis being faced by Ontario children's aid societies. Fully one half of the province's children's aid societies are experiencing budget deficits at a time when

many are also reporting unprecedented increases in their child care case loads.

Metro area societies, including Halton, Peel, York, Durham and Simcoe, have seen their resources strained to the very limit, largely as a result of huge population growth throughout their regions. The Halton Children's Aid Society has experienced an 11% increase in its case load over that in 1989 in terms of monthly days of care. It also has 12.5% more children under its care than it had two years ago.

As my colleague the member for Markham said in this house on 27 March, the children's aid society has undergone review after review and each time the consensus has been that its base budget fails to reflect the reality of its needs. We are talking about children who are incest survivors, victims of abuse, who resort in record numbers to suicide. It is hard to believe that the Premier could say "no more funding" to these children and yet say yes to civil service employees, who receive a 6.1% increase.

I call on the NDP government to stop victimizing the children of Ontario, who are more vulnerable today than they have ever been. It is a time for this NDP Minister of Community and Social Services to deal openly and fairly with the children's aid societies of this province to address the needs of children, the modern victims of the NDP government's misplaced priorities.

HAMILTON REGIONAL CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Mr Abel: Today being Earth Day, it seems appropriate to use this time to congratulate the Hamilton Regional Conservation Authority, which is this year celebrating its 5th anniversary.

Since its establishment in 1966 as the successor to the Spencer Creek Conservation Authority, the HRCA has assumed the responsibility for conserving, restoring, developing and managing the natural resources of its 79-square-kilometre watershed.

Conservation education programs are provided for children from kindergarten through grade 13 throughout the school year. In the summer, popular conservation camps continue the educational process. These programs, centred mainly in the picturesque 1,000-hectare Dundas Valley Conservation Area, teach the importance of conservation to approximately 12,000 children each year.

The lands managed by the HRCA range from quiet, passive, environmentally sensitive areas to the more intensively developed areas such as Christies, Valens, Fifty Point and Confederation Park. Each year an estimated one million people visit these areas to swim, fish, picnic, cross-country ski, hike and simply enjoy nature. We thank the HRCA and extend our congratulations for 25 years of successful conservation.

350

VISITOR

Mr Malkowski: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to introduce Dr Dave Mason, who is visiting here from the University of Alberta and sitting in the members' gallery today.

He is the first deaf person to graduate from a school for the deaf and he eventually earned his PhD from the University of Alberta. He is presently working at the Alberta School for the Deaf; he has been there for 25 years and is now a professor at the University of Alberta. We would like to thank him for being with us here in the House. I would like to present Dr Mason.

Hon Mrs Grier: Mr Speaker, I would like to ask for unanimous consent to make a statement concerning Earth Day.

Agreed to.

EARTH DAY

Hon Mrs Grier: Today is Earth Day and the start of Earth Week in Ontario. Earth Day is a time for us to reflect on the state of our natural surroundings. It is a time for us to renew our commitment to the restoration and protection of the environment for the generations to follow. Special activities to celebrate the Earth have been planned for communities all across Ontario.

The activities in the Metropolitan Toronto area alone are a litany of commitment and creativity and are representative of what is happening everywhere. They include tree planting along the Don River. There is also to be a tree planting at the Humber Arboretum, followed by a nature walk. The Toronto Recycling Action Committee is collecting fine papers at Nathan Phillips Square for recycling. A giant globe was carried from city hall to Queen's Park as part of the walk with the Earth, and a native festival, Project Indigenous Restoration, begins with teachings and ceremonial dancing and concludes with a concert at the Royal Alexandra Theatre.

I have had an opportunity this past week to see at first hand some of the excellent work people are doing. Last Thursday I was on hand for the Recycling Council of Ontario's waste minimization awards. These awards honour the efforts of individuals, businesses, governments, schools and other institutions.

I would like to give special mention to the winners in the individual categories. B. J. Frid won the junior category for singlehandedly starting a recycling program in his grandparents' 10-storey apartment complex. Jeanette Anbinder was honoured for her lifelong commitment to the environment, beginning in the 1960s when she helped found the Unionville recycling depot. In fact, her station wagon was the town's first depot.

Last Friday I spoke to the students at West Humber Collegiate for their symposium on the environment. The students have shown a keen interest in the environment and, following their initiative, an action report has been sent to the Etobicoke Board of Education proposing to make West Humber Collegiate an environmentally focused school. The school's report recognizes the close relationship between the environment and all other disciplines and proposes to make environment an integral part of its entire curriculum. The board has appointed a full-time environmental co-ordinator for the school.

On Saturday 200 people joined the Citizens for a Lakeshore Trail, and David Crombie and I announced the proposed route for the waterfront trail along the shore of

Lake Ontario from Hamilton to Port Hope. These and many other events and activities on Earth Day represent simple, hands-on approaches to environmental restoration and protection.

On a more fundamental level, though, many people have begun to address the root of environmental problems. Just this morning I met with more than 300 executives, academics, private citizens, native representatives and others at a meeting of the Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy. The purpose of the round table is to develop strategies to make environmental considerations a key component to all economic planning.

This approach echoes one of the four principles upon which this government is basing its environmental strategy: We are firmly committed to making environmental concerns part of all our policies and programs throughout all ministries and government bodies; we believe that everyone has a stake in the environment, including both the right to share in it and the responsibility for its protection; we recognize that to create an environment which can sustain our economic activities, we must transform ourselves from a consumer society to a conserver society, and we will implement action programs to clean up existing problems in our environment and develop stronger prevention strategies to head off further damage. We are moving from the traditional approach of "react and cure" to, instead, "anticipate and prevent."

This government has acted on its conviction that Ontario must become a conserver society. We have taken a strong stand by making the 3Rs, reduction, reuse and recycling, the cornerstone of our waste management strategy and efficiency in conservation the foundation of our energy policy.

I invite all the members to join me in honouring the considerable effort that has gone into today's public events. I hope as many of us as possible can take part in the continuing celebration of our planet throughout the balance of Earth Week.

Mr Ramsay: Today, Earth Day is an event being observed worldwide, and it is the global nature of Earth Day's concept that is its most important attribute. It forces us to recognize that environmental problems are in all nations and can and will affect all residents of this planet. But one seldom thinks of the effects of environmental impacts in this manner. It is most sobering to remember that this is the only planet in the universe that supports life. It is not likely we can just use this planet and move on to the next, so let's treat the Earth like we want to stay.

It is easy to point fingers and speak despairingly about high-profile environmental issues such as clear-cutting of the Amazon rain forest, the colossal damage which has occurred in eastern Europe as a result of the industrial discharges into the water, air and on to the land, the oil spills in the Mediterranean and to decry the practices in these nations. But Canada's track record on this issue is far from stellar and it has been said more than once that really enormous problems have been avoided here more by good luck than good management. We must be very careful and examine the impacts of our own lifestyles and, more im-

portant, change those activities where we can make some improvements.

There is a fundamental and important message in the phrase "think globally and act locally," which all of us in this House should constantly reflect upon. Public concern about the environment remains high. The fact that the environment remains so high on the public agenda as we are surrounded by these very tough economic times attests to the very real concern individual people have about this issue.

Once a year, Earth Day puts a focus on the environmentally friendly activities carried out daily across this province. The organizers and participants and all of the Earth Week and Earth Day events deserve our thanks and applause. However, we must not forget all of the people who work so hard to protect our environment and try to make Ontario a better and healthier place to live. The people who work the environment-related programs of ministries such as Natural Resources, Environment, Health and Energy do not get the credit they deserve, nor do the researchers in the private sector, trying to invent the processes or projects which will leave a lighter footprint upon the earth.

We must also recognize the contributions of citizen groups, whether it is a neighbourhood committee in a small town in Ontario helping to clean up and rehabilitate a river valley or a large organization asking the very hard questions about the effect of a project on the environment.

There are literally thousands of individual citizens in this province, young and old, volunteering their time and skills to help protect the environment. It is to these people whether they sit on a local committee, march in a parade, fill a bag with trash from a ravine or plant a tree, that we all owe our greatest debt, and I am very pleased that we in the Legislature are recognizing Earth Day today and, more important, the people who not only care about but are actively trying to protect our environment.

Mr Cousens: On behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus, I am pleased to stand in support of Earth Day and, along with pretty well every other politician who wants to get elected municipally and again in the future, to understand the value of Earth Day and what it means to the future.

It has been a great weekend, and in Markham we even handed out a few shirts to a few people: "Keeping the Country in our Town."

I would like to quote Oscar Wilde, who once said "Experience is the name everyone gives to their mistakes." Given the state of Ontario's environment, this province must be very experienced indeed. Stop and think for a moment just what restraints our environmental carelessness has put on all our lives. Would any of us be so foolish as to attempt to swim in Lake Ontario? Of course not. I has been a very long time since anyone swam in that lake without fear of toxins and raw sewage.

What about the rivers that flow into that poor lake? The hapless Don River starts in the increasingly threatened Oak Ridges moraine. It flows over Lord knows how many garbage dumps, including Keele Valley, the largest, and then it goes down the Don Valley and dumps its content

to the lake. All the rivers in the Metro Toronto area are sick. It is really something when we must warn our children to stay away from the rivers and lakes because they are harmful. One can only wonder what insidious effects this has on the minds of our young, how they are literally taught to fear the natural landscape that my own children and the member for Durham East's and other generations' could have taken for granted.

400

I know that criticism comes easier than craftsmanship, but I cannot help but be stirred by the Minister of the Environment's promises. She has promised us a great deal, no less than an environment reborn, and I, more than anyone else, expect to see this promise kept. So far the minister has poked and prodded at the mess of the environment, but I am afraid to say that I have seen little of substance really done. She has pirouetted and backtracked on the philosophical position of where a given community's garbage is to be disposed of, for the benefit of a few groups who support her. Meanwhile, the rest of us have to come to terms with living on more garbage because we were not among the favoured to be allowed to ship it elsewhere.

What is missing is an all-encompassing plan, a roadmap we can all agree on and follow. For a party which once brought a bill into this House called the Environmental Magna Carta, such a sweeping gesture should be second nature. Whatever she cares to call it—an environmental budget, or perhaps her party's five-year plan—it should address all the environmental concerns in this province and give us a comprehensive plan to solve them. This was long promised to us while the member was in opposition, yet as of late all we have seen from the minister are piecemeal and even contradictory solutions. The minister should do this, and do this soon.

Two generations have grown up in fear of their environment, and indeed nature itself. The Minister of the Environment should make a pledge to all of us that before the next Earth Day arrives, she will have a comprehensive plan for the environment for us to judge and support. To quote Oscar Wilde again: "Children begin by loving their parents; as they grow older, they judge them; sometimes they are forgiven." We have been judged and found wanting. Now let us work to be forgiven.

The Speaker: I appreciate members sending me notes from time to time inquiring about procedures in the House. Regrettably, I must inform the member for Durham Centre that I am not able to comply with his request to announce that the member for Frontenac-Addington is now a grandfather for the first time, as of Saturday 20 April his first grandchild being Morgan Elizabeth Harwood. I cannot make that announcement.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

ASSISTANCE TO KURDS

Hon Ms Ziemba: In the aftermath of the war in the Gulf, we have witnessed the human misery that results from war. I am sure all members will share my concern with the plight of the victims of war, of which the most

recent example is the tragic situation of the Iraqi refugees, including Kurds and Shiites.

As members will know, the International League of Red Cross Societies has launched a worldwide appeal for monetary assistance, and its Ontario division has been sending the Ontario government status reports on its activities in the Gulf region.

In keeping with the province's practice of providing relief assistance in emergency situations like this, I would like to inform the House that the government of Ontario will provide a cash donation of \$200,000 to the Ontario division of the Canadian Red Cross Society. The Canadian Red Cross has already sent help to Iraqi refugees, and we know that this donation from the government will help the Red Cross in its relief activities.

We should also acknowledge the efforts being made by other community organizations. It is very heartening and encouraging that individuals and groups have seized this initiative. Canadians wanting to make a contribution towards the Red Cross relief efforts should make a donation at any office of the Canadian Red Cross, earmarked "Persian Gulf Crisis." For more information they can call the Red Cross at 890-1000, or write to 5700 Cancross Court, Mississauga, Ontario.

ANGELINE DEL COL

Hon Ms Akande: For the past five years, my ministry, with the assistance of Volunteer Ontario, has been honouring volunteers, the backbone of our social service agencies in the province, with Community Service Awards.

Each year one person is selected from the list of 40 Community Service Award recipients to receive the minister's award as Volunteer of the Year. I am delighted to be able to introduce the Volunteer of the Year for 1990, Angeline Del Col of Windsor.

Today, Angeline—or Angie, as she prefers to be called—is seated in the east gallery along with her daughter-in-law Carol. Angie represents all the wonderful volunteers, young and old, from all sectors in the community, who are committed to improving the quality of life for someone in their community. She represents thousands of senior citizens who were volunteers while they were raising their own families and continue to be active volunteers in their retirement.

Angie has never said, "I've done enough; let the young people do their share." That is not her way. It is not her nature to rationalize that she has done her share of giving, especially when she can see the need of the children who come into the care of the Essex County Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society. These are the children who are the victims of neglect, deprivation and abuse, children who have become "unmanageable" because of their mental or emotional disabilities. Angie will step in and calm the child whom others have refused to transport or care for because of the child's behavioural problems.

Twice a month she provides respite care for the foster mother of a physically disabled, non-verbal child. Regardless of the weather conditions, Angie has driven this child for special treatment in London, Kitchener and even Brampton, over 350 kilometres from Windsor. There have

been times when she has volunteered to drive seven days a week and sometimes 12 hours a day.

Angie is particularly sensitive to the children who have been sexually abused. Some of the abused teenagers came into the agency's care at age four or five. Over the years, while driving them to treatment programs, a positive, trusting relationship has evolved between Angie and these children.

In one instance the CAS professionals believe that this special relationship between Angie and a frightened, despondent teenaged girl may have prevented the child from taking her own life. On that day the Windsor region was in the grip of a winter storm that kept many people indoors. While driving this teenager back from treatment, Angie could see that she was terribly depressed. Instead of driving straight home, they stopped at a doughnut shop and they talked. That simple act was enough to convince the youngster that she was lovable and valued, especially by Angie.

This caring woman has worked with the children's aid society for nine years, and I am told that a number of her suggestions for the improvement of programming within the agency have been put into practice. But to listen to Angie tell her story, you would think that she was the recipient of special privileges at the agency.

Since 1981, every infant adopted through the agency has been picked up at the hospital by Angie and delivered to the adoptive parents. Up to now, nine years later, parents remember how Angie wept with happiness along with them as she delivered their new family member.

She is truly a remarkable person. A widow for 15 years, Angie is devoted to the families of her three sons, their seven children, and to her own mother, who is 94. Every day she visits the nursing home to assist her mother at mealtimes. However, last August Angie had to take time off for major surgery. Six weeks later, between her own therapy appointments, Angie was back helping at the agency, as well as caring for her mother.

Angie, you are a marvellous inspiration to all of us. I am deeply honoured to have this opportunity to say how proud we are of you and of the volunteers that you represent this day. On behalf of the people of Ontario, thank you.

1410

RESPONSES

ASSISTANCE TO KURDS

Mr Offer: It is my pleasure to respond to the statement by the Minister of Citizenship. First, I think it is important to underline our full support of this announcement. I think it is also important to recognize, and all members of this House should recognize, that it was the member for Parkdale who first brought this issue to the Legislature last week. In his statement, he asked the government and the Premier and the Minister of Citizenship to make a statement to this effect, helping the Kurdish people who are in such a terrible plight at this time.

I do not think that anyone in this Legislature is not moved by the news reports and indeed the pictures of the plight of the Kurdish people, especially the children, and

the trials and tribulations that they are going through. Although, as I indicated earlier, we fully support this announcement, we also believe that there is another opportunity for this government—indeed, if not an opportunity then an obligation, an obligation to do more.

In previous disaster situations, and I think back to the Jamaican and the Armenian ones, previous governments provided not just dollars, but where appropriate supplies. I believe it is fitting in this case for this government to take a look at whether there is that opportunity to provide not just dollars but supplies such as beds, tents and sheets. So many of those things which we take for granted are indeed things that are badly needed at this point in time.

I support this announcement. We harken back to the statement by the member for Parkdale and we ask this government to not only look at the forwarding of dollars to those who are so badly in need, but also to seriously consider the forwarding of supplies, tents, sheeting and transportation to those people, to those children, who are so badly in need.

ANGELINE DEL COL

Mr Beer: I want to rise and on behalf the official opposition thank Angeline Del Col for all of the work that she has done, and through her to thank the so many thousands of volunteers who work not only with the Ministry of Community and Social Services or through the various transfer payment agencies, but indeed the volunteers who work in programs throughout the province.

It was my pleasure a year ago to have the opportunity to meet the Volunteer of the Year and indeed to go around the province and meet with many volunteers who worked within the community and social service area. I think one of the greatest things for us as legislators is when we get out and we have that opportunity to meet the hundreds and thousands of people who work, like Angie does, with all the different community-based groups and organizations.

We realize that there is simply no way in which government would be able to provide all of those services. It is always very difficult to say thank you because it is a phrase which we use so often. But I think through honouring the Volunteer of the Year and indeed through honouring all of the volunteers who will be present at the four or five regional dinners at which the ministry thanks all those who help, that Angie would understand that in paying tribute to her and to all of her good works, we are also paying tribute to all of those other countless volunteers without whom this province would not be the kind of province that it is.

Again, on behalf of our party, I want to thank Angie for all her work and to thank all of the volunteers who have given so much of their time and effort.

ASSISTANCE TO KURDS

Mr Cousens: On behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus, I would like to compliment the minister for the efforts that she is taking behalf of the government, for the concern that they are showing to the Iraqi refugees.

I think there are times in our society when we think we've hard done by, but when we see on TV the anguish and the suffering, the pain, the sorrow, the death that is going on among the Kurds, we just cannot stand by and not do something. I congratulate her.

I also commend the government for choosing the Red Cross as the distributor of the fund. The Red Cross was there first after the war to pick up some of the pieces, and so often we just take the Red Cross for granted. The fact that the government is allowing its money to flow through the Red Cross is again a good statement of how government and a community agency can work together to achieve their objectives without government trying to do it all by itself.

I hope that the people of Ontario who have the resources, as they have done with the food banks and other things, will help people who cannot help themselves. I hope that all of us who are in a position to do something to help the people who are suffering in Iraq and Iran and on the Turkish border, the Kurds, are doing what they can personally and sending their contribution to the Red Cross.

I was delighted that in her announcement the minister indicated the Red Cross phone number and I will repeat it. If someone wants to know how to give to this worthy cause, the Red Cross is at 416-890-1000. I thank the government and I compliment it. I am proud that both our provincial and federal governments are doing something to meet the need of these people.

ANGELINE DEL COL

Mr Jackson: I am pleased, on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party, to acknowledge the welcome presence of Angeline Del Col in the Legislature today and to congratulate her for receiving Ontario's Volunteer of the Year award.

We recognize from having met her and reading the résumé provided by the minister that we are dealing with a woman of great compassion and understanding for the needs of many of the vulnerable citizens in our society, and particularly those most vulnerable, who are our children. We agree that no more worthy recipient has been chosen.

However, it is important to note that Angie is here also representing the Essex County Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society as the fortunate association which benefits from her extensive commitment and her volunteering experience. It is worthy of note that there is a current crisis in this province with respect to the funding of children's aid societies.

With the increased demand of children who, as the minister has stated in her announcement, are victims of neglect, deprivation and abuse, children who have become unmanageable because of their mental or emotional disabilities, today in Ontario there are over 10,000 children on waiting lists for mental health services. We know that the deficits being experienced in our children's aid societies were projected last February at around \$36 million, and some suggest it may be as high as \$50 million as of this very moment. What that means is that thousands of children who are victims of sexual abuse and other emo-

tional distresses are resorting to record numbers of suicides in this province, and that is a matter which has been raised.

If there is anything I have ever learned about human nature, if there is anything I know about the volunteer sector as embodied by the most worthy recipient today, it is that these people would willingly trade all of the wonderful acknowledgements and awards and all that recognition if we could finally get through to government that government has laws to ensure the protection of individuals, especially those most vulnerable, especially our children in need. The volunteer sector would willingly trade those accolades for the necessary funding to ensure that we remain a compassionate province and that we are there to help serve the needs of those children who are in such dire straits.

Although I cannot speak for the worthy recipient, I am quite convinced that, given her commitment to those children in the Windsor area, she very much represents the hope and desire that this government, like all governments, will put the appropriate priority on the needs of children in our society.

CABINET MEMBERS

Mr Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Before the next order of business, would you not agree with me that it would be appropriate if the head of the government, on rearranging his cabinet just a couple of hours ago, might in fact make some reasonable statement to the House about those new arrangements? We could perhaps use time of question period to ask him about the usefulness of doubling up the responsibility of the Minister of Health with the Chairman of Management Board, but of course any difficulties in that regard remain to be seen. He has even arranged it so that we do not have an opportunity to express our congratulations and wish them well if that sort of a feeling were to surge to the surface.

It just occurs to me that while this is the second time this has occurred, and I am not looking forward to it happening again, it is useful if the head of the government, even though he has announced these things to the press and even though it is on something called email, might very well indicate to the House what these changes are and what the justifications are for them.

Far be it from me to tell him how to do his job. I have never done it and never will. But it suggests to me, Mr Speaker, as a point of order, that it would be useful if all of the House were given the advantage of a formal announcement of the head of the government.

The Speaker: I appreciate the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He may know that this is not really a procedural matter. It is at the discretion of the Premier to make announcements, indeed to make a statement in the House. That is at his choice.

1420

ORAL QUESTIONS

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Nixon: If I may direct a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services, who was in her place a moment ago or will be back in a moment—perhaps as she is not in her place at this moment I will direct it to the Premier. Since the best efforts of the Minister of Labour and the Treasurer have resulted now in about 569,000 people in the province being unemployed, and just as important and perhaps even more tragic, 909,000 people in Ontario in receipt of social assistance of some form or another, can the Premier indicate what further efforts are going to be undertaken so that the money that is made available from the Treasury is going to be directed towards those communities where the impact of this recession, which seems to be going longer and deeper than expected, can be more effectively mitigated?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me answer very directly to the Leader of the Opposition by saying that, first of all, one of the things that has become clear to us is that our own welfare system has become a kind of secondary form of unemployment insurance for thousands of people in the province. This is not what was intended.

It is because of two things: first of all, the severity of the recession, which is the most serious recession we have experienced in its impact since the Second World War; and second the changes not to say cuts in programs at the federal level in terms of unemployment insurance, which have in fact—and I can show this objectively to the people of the province—substantially increased the expenditures we have to make.

We are making those expenditures, first of all, in the form of income support—that is the first fundamental thing that needs to be done, and that commitment on our part is very clear; second, in ensuring that the system is working better. We appointed a committee as soon as we were elected to get the SARC reforms back on track, and that is something which we are looking at very closely as I speak.

Finally, it is important to stress that it is not widely known, but the ministry which spends more money on retraining than any other ministry within the government is the Ministry of Community and Social Services, which right now is spending \$300 million-plus on training and retraining in order to give people the skills that they need in order to get back into the workforce.

Mr Nixon: If I may just reiterate my comments that the unemployment levels at over 500,000 and the welfare rolls at something less than 900,000 are matters that we would all agree, and certainly the Premier has indicated this, are matters of most serious proportions. I think the concern that I would like to put to the Premier in a supplementary question is, how can he explain why communities like Cambridge, where the welfare case load has increased by 80% and over 500 jobs have been lost in the last six months, received less than 0.5% of the special allocation

of the Treasurer's funds that were designed to assist those most directly hit by the recession?

I cannot make that point any clearer than that, other than to say that the Minister of Community and Social Services was not involved, it appears, in any way in advising the Treasurer and the Minister of Labour in directing the money to where it was needed. I simply reiterate that all the statistics available from the government would indicate that the money is not sent to where it is needed but to where the press releases would have perhaps the most political impact.

The question is: Why did they really not give the money to the Minister of Community and Social Services so that the money would be directed to where her case load is growing most rapidly and is having the most immediate effect on the community?

Hon Mr Rae: I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that unemployment insurance rates and indeed welfare rates were two of the criteria which were very explicitly dealt with and very explicitly the criteria that the Treasurer and the Minister of Community and Social Services and the Chairman of Management Board and all those who were involved in making the decisions as to where and how the \$700 million would be spent, dealt with. Those criteria were very explicit parts of the agenda, very explicitly dealt with, so when the Leader of the Opposition says they could not have been taken into account, he is simply wrong.

Mr Nixon: I certainly accept the advice offered by the Premier as correct and at face value, but the numbers simply do not support his contention that I am wrong. As a matter of fact, the taxpayers have provided us with a very capable research component and those fine young men and women have spent a good deal of time relating the very things that the Premier says have been carried out effectively by his ministers.

Our statistics show there is no relationship whatsoever with the allocation of the \$700 million with the need in the community. As a matter of fact, if a person were perverse in his or her observation of these matters, you would think that the Minister of Community and Social Services had no part to play whatsoever and that the Treasurer somehow simply drew numbers out of a hat and sent the money around the province on that basis.

So I would say that Cambridge is not an isolated case. In Dufferin-Peel the welfare case load has increased 120%. In Brant county, God save us, the welfare case load has increased 71%. In Peel it has increased 91%, and in York region the increase is over 100%. In each instance the allocation from the Treasury has been in the order of 1% or less of the \$700 million.

I would simply ask the Premier again to see that those statistics are reviewed and to indicate to the House why there is no appropriate relationship.

Hon Mr Rae: We think there is. For example, the Leader of the Opposition talks about the rate of the increase. I can tell him that despite the fact that the rate of the increase, for example in York region, is high, the absolute numbers in terms of the relationship between the num-

er of unemployed and the overall workforce still is much lower in York region than it is in many parts of northern Ontario. Northern Ontario receives 30% of the allocation of the funds that were there. The Windsor area has been particularly hard hit, where there was not only a very substantial increase in the number but the absolute number is very large. We have tried to respond to need as effectively as we can.

I find it ironic that the Leader of the Opposition spent the first few months saying we were not doing anything, and now that he realizes we have done something, he says we have done the wrong thing. Well, there you are. We cannot please everybody.

Mr Nixon: The Premier obviously pleases some people but he does not please me, because his \$700 million is going to create only enough jobs to compensate for the jobs lost in two weeks of the economic management that he has provided, and of course we are not pleased with that.

TAX REVENUES

Mr Nixon: I have an interest in another matter that is of special interest when we know what is going to happen to us or when we, let's say, look forward to what is going to happen to us a week from today at 4 o'clock in the afternoon if the Treasurer is permitted to present his budget.

He is aware that the constituency of Brant-Haldimand has a large number of tobacco growers. He is aware also of other associations with the tobacco-marketing business that are associated with my constituency.

I was interested in reading about the projected results of the large increase in the tobacco tax from the federal level, particularly since there is a possibility that there might be even further adjustments next week, although it is very difficult to imagine that that could happen. It now appears that there is a tremendous loss of revenue because of the sale of untaxed cigarettes and smuggled cigarettes. As a matter of fact, there is some indication at the federal level that the loss of revenue across Canada, federally and provincially, is something like \$900 million. If this were to be prorated into this province, it is possible that that loss could be \$300 million, but of course there is no way of the people knowing.

I would like to put a question to the Minister of Revenue and ask her if she has any information as to what the effects not just of the federal budget but the cumulative effects of the increase in taxation and the reduction of sales would have on our revenues, particularly as we see evidence, and it is reported day by day, of cigarettes without taxes paid being on the market very readily.

30

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: I am very much aware of the impact of a tobacco tax and also the impact of tobacco smuggling. I am very concerned about this problem and the impact it is having on our lost revenues right now in the province. As the member is aware, these revenues are essential for funding for health care programs, as an example.

To combat this problem of tobacco smuggling, the Ministry of Revenue recently has begun a retail inspection

program and the sanctions provided by the Tobacco Tax Act will be enforced. As well, the ministry is working with federal law enforcement agencies to investigate the larger-scale evasion schemes.

Mr Nixon: Since there is some indication that the loss may be \$300 million during this coming year, which is much more than significant since if applied to many of these programs that are referred to day by day in question period it would be very useful indeed, and since the province of Ontario has introduced a rather expensive tobacco package marketing scheme, would the minister explain why there has been no inspection and no enforcement that is perceived in the community in any way. Can she explain why her revenue officials have not taken any action in this regard, and if it is possible, perhaps she might indicate if there have been any charges laid on the basis of the new marketing procedure.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: My staff are made aware of smuggling that has happened only when somebody has informed them or when they know about it. They are out there doing inspections, but they can find out about particular ones only when they are reported. When it became obvious and apparent in the newspapers that there was smuggling going on, my staff were on it right away and are investigating some of those instances now.

Mr Nixon: I am aware the Ministry of Revenue has spent advertising funds encouraging people to report on any retailers who may be selling tax-free or unnaturally low-priced cigarettes. I know all smoking members of this Legislature would be quick to report if they found a place where they could buy them at reduced cost. But it may be that the minister and her officials are somewhat naïve in this respect, and for her to have a campaign asking people to rat on their retailer—I think that is the slogan or something like it—in my view is a waste of money and probably accounts for the reason the amount of money the honourable minister is losing is mounting up very rapidly. Can she assure the House that we are going to have an enforcement and inspection program that is going to reduce this possible \$300 million in loss for the benefit of the Treasurer, who is in such dire need these days.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: Like the Leader of the Opposition, we are very concerned about our revenues and we will do what we can to make sure we do not lose revenues, particularly through the tobacco tax.

COURT SYSTEM

Mr Harris: My question is to the Attorney General. I was shocked this weekend to learn that a manslaughter case had been stayed as a result of last October's Askov decision. I was also shocked that there was no statement from the Attorney General today expressing his viewpoint on this case or explaining to us why this was allowed to happen, either the time it took to get the case there or the lack of action on his part.

I know an appeal has been launched, but quite frankly that response is just is not good enough. A man has died. His family deserves to see justice done and quite frankly the integrity of the justice system, as the minister knows, is

deteriorating daily when the threat of deterrence is diminished. Will the Attorney General tell this House why he failed to instruct the crown attorney to bring forward a motion to preserve this charge.

Hon Mr Hampton: I do not know in what context the leader of the third party has concocted a motion to preserve the charge. The fact of the matter is that crown attorneys around the province are scheduling trials as soon as they may be tried. They are scheduling the most serious cases as soon as they can be. The fact of the matter is also that the charge in question was a very complicated charge. It required at least nine days of hearings: it required some 80 witnesses and trying to find time to schedule such a complex matter is somewhat difficult.

The crown attorney who is responsible for the prosecution of this charge in Ottawa has placed all of that information on the public record and that is where the matter stands at this time.

Mr Harris: We are not talking here about a minor offence, we are talking about a brutal beating. The Attorney General's own crown attorney says that it is just this type of case which really affects the public's confidence in the justice system.

Over five months ago, the Attorney General promised that the more serious charges would be advanced to earlier hearing dates. Clearly, he is to blame for the fact that this did not occur in this particular case. He is the one who made the commitment, he is the one who made the statement; he is the one who made the promise and he told us this would happen.

Quite simply, I would ask the Attorney General, did he have any knowledge of this case prior to last Friday and if he did not, why did he not?

Hon Mr Hampton: To point out to the leader of the third party again, all charges in the province were reviewed to move as many serious charges forward as could possibly be moved. However, even in the Askov judgement, and I invite the leader of the third party to read it, the Supreme Court of Canada acknowledges there will be complex cases which may require greater than eight months to bring to trial. I would suggest to the leader of the third party that a charge which involves some 80 witnesses and which requires at least nine days to hear is such a complex case. In fact, we will look at appealing this charge on exactly the basis that it is a complex case within the criteria set down in the Askov judgement.

Mr Harris: Clearly, as I asked the Attorney General in the first question, if he felt time was becoming a problem, he could bring a motion before the judge asking to move this case up. I asked him in the first question why he did not do that. He did not appear to understand he even had the power to do that, but it is the Attorney General who made this promise and it is his department that is to carry out this promise.

The Speaker: Is this the second question?

Mr Harris: By way of final supplementary, it is the Attorney General's responsibility to make sure the serious cases are being heard. The quote from the defence lawyer himself in Saturday's *Globe and Mail* says it all. He says,

"If there's blame to be attached, it's squarely at the feet of the Attorney General's office."

The Attorney General's promises of last November are clearly not worth the paper they are written on. Victims and their families certainly do not take much comfort in them. The Attorney General is responsible for the justice system in this province. Since assurances of five months ago are obviously out the window, what assurances can he give us that we can have any faith in that system, because quite frankly we have seen nothing so far to give us any kind of encouragement?

Hon Mr Hampton: The leader of the third party seems to place a lot of faith in the comments and opinions of the defence counsel in this case. To set the record straight, and I recognize the third party might not want to hear this information, on the date that the Askov judgement came down, there were some 212,000 charges outstanding in the system. Some of those charges were over two years old. In fact, the Askov judgement itself relates to a date when there was a Conservative government in this province. That is how old the backlog is.

Interjections.

1440

The Speaker: I am quite confident all of us remember our quest from last week that we want to get a lot of questions and responses in and keep them succinct.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I intend to be able to hear both the questions and the replies. Would the Attorney General respond?

Hon Mr Hampton: As I was saying, on the date that the Askov judgement came down on 12 October, there was a backlog of some 212,000 charges. Since that date, the court system in Ontario has been able to deal with 117,000 charges in six months.

The leader of the third party asks what confidence people can have in the justice system in the province. I want to point this out to him. Since the Askov judgement came down, which is approximately the time that we became the government, 98.8% of all charges that have been laid are scheduled for trial within eight months. That is better than his government ever did and better than the previous Liberal government ever could have done.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr Cousens: My question is to the Minister of the Environment. There is some degree of disappointment today on this side of the House. Today we in this province join hands with people around the world in commemoration of Earth Day. The Minister of the Environment, while obviously sincere in her remarks earlier, has missed an excellent opportunity to bring forth substantive initiatives by her ministry.

It has become very clear to us that the range of issues she has wanted to tackle has been reduced dramatically. Therefore, will the minister tell this House which of the following projects are today, at this very moment, currently under consideration by cabinet: the environmental bill of rights, amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act, regulations on pesticide use, a Safe Drinking

Water Act, amendments to the clean air program and regulations on waste reduction?

Does the minister not think she owes it to the people of Ontario at least to let them know what her priorities are? Does she have at least one piece of legislation that is before cabinet today, yes or no?

Hon Mrs Grier: I am sure the member realizes I am not able to tell him what issues are before cabinet or on the cabinet agenda, but let me assure the member that all of the issues he has enumerated are very much on the agenda of this government and of my ministry.

Mr Cousens: When teachers mark tests, if you say, "Yes or no, is any one of those initiatives before cabinet today?"—the minister did not answer it. They are all on the government's agenda somewhere, but they are not before cabinet and that is the problem.

I would like to refer to the minister's announcements regarding waste reduction and the whole issue of waste disposal. This minister has flip-flopped on which community can transport its garbage outside its boundaries, this minister has ruled out incineration as an option for dealing with solid municipal waste and this minister has told us he will meet diversion targets by 25% in 1992 and 50% by the year 2000. And yet, this same minister still has not introduced one measure that indicates how her ministry plans on dealing with the waste crisis.

During estimates I asked a number of questions, along with the member for Renfrew North, which were supposed to be answered by 12 March. That is over a month ago. Most of those questions were answered. However, one in particular was not answered at all. My staff has called numerous times to get an answer from the minister's department regarding this question.

Today I will ask her the same question in the House that I asked her in estimates well over a month ago. Which communities, most notably in the greater Toronto area, will run out of landfill capacity in the next year, the next three years and the next five years? "If you cannot answer me this specific question, how in the world can we believe that you have a credible strategy on waste reduction?"

Hon Mrs Grier: I have a very credible strategy on waste reduction and, in fact, I am disappointed in the tone of the member's question.

He has stood in this House and called upon the government, whether it be that government or this government, to get serious about waste reduction, waste reuse and waste recycling. I think he does know that we are more serious and we have taken more action and we have made more progress on waste reduction, waste reuse and waste recycling than any other government before us.

Mrs Marland: We had really hoped that at least on Earth Day we might have had an answer from the Minister of the Environment, and it is a big disappointment that we do not have that.

When this minister talks about an agenda and when she talks about a credible strategy, she had better start looking at her cabinet ministers and the rest of her government members because we have a situation in this province

which is no longer just a garbage crisis; it is emerging into a number of other areas.

An example I will give her is the land freeze around the region of Peel Britannia landfill site. That land freeze is now causing at least one million labour hours lost, so we are talking about a labour crisis as a result of this minister's inaction. The more they delay the development of land adjacent to that site, the longer it will be before we have approximately 5,000 units for housing being built in that proximity.

My question is that this minister has one policy and it seems to be inconsistency. Will she explain to this House her policy on shipping municipal waste outside of the municipality in question? Is the GTA no-shipping decision her policy? Is the Kingston ship-to-Ottawa decision her policy? For that matter, does she have a consistent policy, or does she plan to compound the confusion by deciding each case on an ad hoc basis?

Hon Mrs Grier: Let me try once again to make very clear the waste management policy of this government.

It starts with the 3Rs, and I have enumerated on countless occasions what we have done and how we are moving and how effective that policy is being and how very popular that policy is and how very environmentally sound that policy is.

We recognize, no matter how much we reduce, reuse and recycle, there will be a residue, and for that disposal sites are required. Instead of taking easy, out of sight out of mind solutions, we are looking for long-term answers. We have said in the case of the GTA that the long-term disposal site will be within the boundaries of the GTA.

The crisis did not start on 1 October; it was there when we took office, and we are indeed, as the member says, having to look at each particular crisis and make the best environmentally sound decision to deal with each particular situation in the short term. That is what we have done; that is what we will continue to do.

TERMINATION AGREEMENT

Mr Elston: I have a question for the Premier of the province. It concerns a copyright article in the Kingston Whig-Standard entitled "Secret Bonus Muzzled Fired NDP Staffer," written by Michael Woloschuk and Bill Hutchinson, and it deals with an issue surrounding the member for Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings, who was quoted as saying that he has an issue which "Bob Rae is going to find quite a concern."

Mr Speaker, can you get the Premier back—oh, there he is. "Peekaboo Bob" is doing his stuff.

I am sure the Premier will know that the Premier's chief assistant, David Reville, has negotiated on behalf of the Premier and the NDP caucus a secret legal agreement to silence a disaffected constituency worker in Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings. When asked about the agreement, Mr Reville is quoted as saying, "It's a mystery that you'll have to live with."

1450

Will the Premier release the contents of the agreement so that the taxpaying public can find out what they are paying for?

Hon Mr Rae: No. The member, I am sure, would recognize that there are situations which everyone is involved in from time to time in which there are employment disputes and in which people, after negotiations and after a period of discussion, agree that employment will be terminated, and there are certain discussions which take place and a settlement was arrived in this situation.

I can say to the member that it happens with his members, it happens with Conservative Party members and it happens with our members. There are situations, I am sure, where people have left his employ and there has been an agreement that a settlement will be arrived at and that the terms of the settlement will not be discussed by the parties. That is not an unusual situation. It is a very common situation in public life and in private life, and it is not the least bit unusual.

Mr Elston: I thank the Premier for his answer. It is what we are beginning to expect from him and this group of people when it comes to dealing with taxpayers' money. The Premier's secret agreement carries a hefty price for the taxpayer, and this is a price that the MPP for Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings described as being exorbitant. One finds that if you are fired from the NDP caucus after working for only three months plus a few days, you can make between \$10,000 and \$15,000 in severance and vacation pay. According to a labour management specialist at Queen's University, most workers in Ontario would have to work for 15 years to get that much severance.

Given the desperate financial situation that many people find themselves in in the province of Ontario, can the Premier tell us that he finds the size of the payment and the reasons for the payment acceptable to him?

Hon Mr Rae: I am not going to get into the details of every employment agreement that is reached by members, any more than I would dream of doing so in his case. I find it ironic: The Leader of the Opposition says that he is more worried about the state of the economy and about what is happening about the big picture than anyone else. Perhaps it might be reflected in some of the questions coming from members opposite with regard to this.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The rules of the House clearly preclude members like the Premier, although he slips day by day, from imputing motives and doing things like he has just done with us there. His small-mindedness is becoming very difficult to accept when we all have bigger issues to deal with, but when he wants to cover up taxpayers' money being spent on hush deals, that is a big problem.

The Speaker: I listened very closely, and the language was not tempered. The member will also realize that that is not a point of order.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Premier. On page 1 of the NDP report entitled Highway Robbery, which he co-authored and presented to the Osborne commission in 1987, he stated, "We also believe just as strongly that people must retain their right to sue."

On page 17 of the same document, the Premier wrote that, "New Democrats are opposed to the loss of individual legal rights"—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I suppose when we have the weekend off we come back well-rested, keen and eager, ready to jump into the fray, but the honourable member for Willowdale is patiently waiting to place his question.

Mr Harnick: On page 1 of the Premier's report entitled Highway Robbery, he stated, "We also believe just as strongly that people must retain their right to sue."

On page 17 of the same document, the Premier wrote that, "New Democrats are opposed to the loss of individual legal rights entailed by such thresholds, just as we are opposed to the wholesale elimination by so-called pure no-fault arrangements."

It is now clear, as indicated by statements made by the Treasurer at a no-fault symposium a week ago Friday in Sudbury and by the Minister of Financial Institutions when he met with a group by the name of Physicians Against the Insurance Nightmare, that the NDP is preparing to turn its back on its own policy. It is now clear that the government will break its promise and implement a pure no-fault system, complete with a tribunal and a meat chart, in which innocent accident victims are reduced to the status of supplicants who must take what the tribunal offers with no chance for individualized compensation.

My question for the Premier is this: Taking into account his total hedging on this issue in recent weeks, can he confirm that legislation to this effect has already been drafted and is simply awaiting cabinet approval?

Hon Mr Rae: I will be glad to answer that quite emphatically and clearly. I can tell him that no legislation to that effect has been drafted at all. I can tell him that he is jumping to conclusions which are quite unwarranted. I want to give him that assurance on my part, and I want to tell him, as I have said before in answer to previous questions from him and from the member for Leeds-Grenville, that this matter is under very active consideration, in terms of ensuring that we have a plan which ensures safety on the highways, which ensures access to compensation, which ensures a driver-owned plan which will be the most efficient plan available, and which ensures that innocent accident victims have access to the best possible system of compensation. That is the determination on the part of the government, and that determination still remains.

Mr Harnick: I am dismayed because the Premier talks about "access to the best possible." Well, before he was Premier, "access" was access to the courts, and one group that may be angered by the pending betrayal is the Ontario Teachers' Federation. In their submission to the standing committee on general government on 17 January of last year, the federation stated: "The right to sue is a fundamental right and is the appropriate method of seeking compensation in motor vehicle accident cases. It should be preserved for the citizens of Ontario."

On 8 February of last year, the St Catharines and District Labour Council stated that, "We also believe just as strongly that people must retain their right to sue."

In November 1990, after he was the Premier, he stated, "There will be fair access to the courts."

My question to the Premier is this, and he has been asked this question numerous times before, will he keep that promise? Not the best possible access to whatever tribunal: Will there be access to the courts for all individuals injured in motor vehicle accidents, as he promised before he was the Premier and as he has promised since becoming the Premier?

Hon Mr Rae: I am going to have to ask the member for Willowdale to show a little patience in this regard. He has a commitment from this government that legislation will be discussed fully in the House and that there will be ample opportunity for debate and discussion in the province. I will say to him again and repeat in answer to the question which he asked previously when he said, "Has legislation been drafted," that the answer to that is emphatically no.

1500

EDUCATION POLICY

Ms Haeck: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Education. I have been meeting with groups in my area and they are very concerned about the issue of destreaming. For these groups destreaming appears to be the one way of eliminating the inequity in educational outcomes experienced by disadvantaged children in the community. My question is, how will the minister address the issue of streaming in the Ontario school system?

Hon Mrs Boyd: I thank the member for the question. This is a matter of great concern to all stakeholders in the education system. We have been in consultation on the transition years for some time and have received many responses that indicate concern. They range from those who would like us to examine the whole issue of streaming right from the very first years, right through school, to those who are very concerned about the effects on class size and on curriculum material and teaching methodology if the target set by the previous government of September 1992 is adhered to too strongly by the ministry.

Because we are in the course of those consultations and because there has been so much interest raised, we are basically telling our stakeholders that we too are committed to the notion of destreaming as one way of ensuring equity of outcomes, but that until we can be sure that we have a system that is going to operate effectively and that we are assured of successful destreaming in a way that will not be sabotaged by too large a class size or too little training in terms of teaching in that situation, we may well consider extending that deadline at the advice of our consultants.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr Bradley: I have a question for the Treasurer, and it relates to election promises. I think everybody in the province recognizes that his party's leader, during the election campaign, promised the moon. I have to agree that the government did deliver on that promise.

Hon Mr Rae: How long have you been waiting to tell that?

Mr Bradley: I have been waiting all weekend. I have a different question for the Treasurer that is near and dear to his heart, and I have a couple of quotes to go with it that I know will make the Treasurer happy. The first is from the Minister of Northern Development, who wrote a letter to the Minister of Mines in 1990 and said, "Your decision to allow Falconbridge to refine their ore offshore for the next 10 years is totally reprehensible."

The Treasurer himself said this in 1981: "To this day, every pound of ore taken out of the ground by Falconbridge is shipped to Norway for refining, for almost 50 years. That is simply outrageous."

I want to ask the Treasurer this question, which was asked by the Premier on 19 December 1985, the exact question, Why will the Treasurer "not change section 104 of the Mining Act, refuse Falconbridge any further exemptions and insist that if it has the money to buy a mine in Timmins and not add a single new job to the economy, it ought to be adding jobs to the economy by refining enough and upgrading the ore it produces here?"

Hon Mr Laughren: I am glad to see that the member for St Catharines has figured out a way to allow his leader to get him on the question period list.

I would say to the member for St Catharines that for many years I thought Falconbridge should be refining its ores, at least in Canada and preferably in Ontario, and preferably in the Sudbury basin, because it still ships those ores to Norway for refining. I was disappointed when the former government—and members know that I am not wont to put blame on the former government for anything. However, the former government did pass an order in council that, for 10 years, gave Falconbridge the right to continue to ship its ores unrefined to Norway. I can recall thinking at the time, "Gee whiz, I hope that order in council isn't binding." Having investigated the matter fully, I find out now that it is.

Mr Bradley: The Treasurer would want me to use yet another quote, and it is the Treasurer then asking a question of another Treasurer. This was 7 December 1987. He says: "All you have to do is stop the exemptions. You do not even have to amend the act, Treasurer. You do not even have to amend the Mining Act. Just enforce it and stop giving exemptions."

But that is not the question I am going to ask. The question I am going to ask on the mining industry is the following: At the 1988 NDP convention, there was a resolution that came forward that is near and dear to the heart of the Treasurer and many other members of the Legislature with an NDP background. It says, "Be it resolved that the NDP of Ontario support the immediate nationalization of Inco in Ontario; and be it further resolved that an NDP government will bring the Ontario resource corporations of Inco, Falconbridge, Rio Algom and Denison Mines into public ownership as part of the industrial strategy."

Could the Treasurer inform us when he intends to implement this NDP policy.

Hon Mr Laughren: I should tell the member he has to be patient on matters like this. I can recall very well that debate, that convention and that particular resolution.

Mr Bradley: And he supported it.

Hon Mr Laughren: Yes, and I can tell the member that just as I feel about the processing, I have always felt that the resources that are in the ground actually do belong to all the people and—

Mr Bradley: Now that he is in government—

Hon Mr Laughren: If the member should let me answer the question, that the maximum return should be returned to the people, particularly for those non-renewable resources. I still believe that as strongly as I ever have believed that. I would simply put to the member that we have—

Mr Sorbara: They are for sale now.

Hon Mr Laughren: In the free market, I would assume that they are for sale. I would just say to the member that as we try and cope with the very serious problems in this province, for the moment that is not one of our priorities.

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Arnott: My question is for the Minister of Transportation. As the minister is well aware, the Ontario trucking industry is experiencing severe financial difficulties. As we speak, truckers are once again feeling forced to blockade border points with the United States, because of provincial government inaction.

In recent months there has been a 156% increase in bankruptcies in the trucking industry in Ontario. Each month approximately 15 trucking companies close their doors in this province. Nine per cent of these companies are relocating to the United States. Hundreds of jobs are being lost every time a trucking company shuts down or moves to the United States.

As NDP opposition critic, the minister always expressed grave concern over the plight of Ontario's trucking industry. I ask the Minister of Transportation, is he still so concerned about the plight of Ontario truckers in this province, and if so, why has he in the past eight months since he has been in office done nothing to assist Ontario truckers?

Hon Mr Philip: It is incorrect that we have done nothing since we have taken office and I will be happy to spell out to the member exactly what we have taken.

But the transporter blockade this morning was taken by the truckers, according to their statements for the following reasons: They said they were protesting the deregulation by the federal government, that they were protesting free trade by the federal government, that they were protesting high interest by the federal government and that they were protesting the exchange rate by the federal government.

It is no accident that the blockade is at the border. It is a transborder problem. I have indicated to the truckers that I would be happy to meet with them if they can elect some representatives to meet with me and I have said that I would be happy to speak to the Honourable Jean Corbeil, who is the new federal Minister of Transport and has some jurisdiction over this.

Mr Arnott: The minister continues to blame everyone but himself for his own failure to act. There are things that he can do. This government has been in office for eight months. How long is it going to take before the minister sheds his opposition mentality and starts to act as a responsible minister of the crown?

Hon Mr Philip: This government has acted. For example, we have recently arranged for quarterly payments of licence fees, which are helping with the cash flow of the trucking industry. We have stepped up enforcement, and indeed since I have been the minister there have been some 2,000 new charges laid against truckers who are breaking the Ministry of Revenue and fuel tax problems. We have hosted forums to deal with the transportation programs, which is exactly what the trucking industry asked for. We have accelerated programs of enforcement.

For a Conservative to cry over the state of the trucking industry is the equivalent, after what they have done, to a murderer crying at the funeral of a victim. That is what it is.

1510

PROCEEDS OF CRIME

Mr Morrow: My question is of the Solicitor General. Police in my riding of Wentworth East have been frustrated by federal legislation which requires the forfeiture of the proceeds of crime to the federal government rather than being distributed to the police force that retrieved the proceeds. Given that the police forces across the province are experiencing fiscal constraints, what is the Solicitor General going to do to enable police services to retain money and goods confiscated?

Hon Mr Farnan: This issue is of significant concern to municipal police forces across the province, and at the bottom of this issue is a basic unfairness. Proceeds from most other forms of crime are under the jurisdiction of the provincial Attorney General. However, Bill C-61 requires that the proceeds of crime related to drug offences be forfeited and disposed of by the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

The significant contribution of our excellent policing service in the province of Ontario has not been recognized by the federal government. The work that they put into this area of drug enforcement has not been recognized by the federal government. If we want effective drug enforcement, then the federal government better recognize this and supply some of the funding to our municipal police forces.

MANDATORY RETIREMENT

Mr Mahoney: My question is of the minister responsible for—bear with me, it takes time to read this title—citizenship, race relations, human rights, the disabled and senior citizens' affairs. While I call her the mother of all cabinet ministers—I think it is appropriate with all that work—let me try once again to get the minister's attention on behalf of senior citizens in this province.

As she is aware, the senior citizens are being discriminated against in Ontario, and frankly it is legal. The Ontario Human Rights Code does not protect them from

mandatory retirement. Mandatory retirement is discriminatory to all seniors and it especially disadvantages women seniors, because in many cases they have not been able to build up the financial resources to which most men have access. The majority of women have not held jobs which entitle them to private pensions. They have earned in the past only 60% of what their male counterparts earn. Also, they receive only a fraction of CPP benefits as compared to men.

Furthermore, women's work history has often been sporadic because of the demands of childbearing and childrearing. Surely the injustice of forcing seniors into unemployment simply because they have reached their 55th birthday is obvious. My question is whether the minister will end this shameful force of age discrimination which affects all seniors in this province and is particularly devastating for older women.

Hon Ms Ziemba: Thank you very much for the question. I share the member's concerns about women, especially women who have come to retirement and have not been able to accumulate the pensions that men have.

I think what we have to look at is that we want to make sure that all people—and our government is committed—can retire in comfort and dignity with independence. One of the things that we must do and we have started to do is to make sure that pay equity is in force so that women are not earning 60% of the income that men earn. We also are making sure that we have employment equity so that all people, whether it is visible minorities, women or persons with disabilities, are able to again have income that is suitable for retirement in the long run. We are also making sure that we do have opportunities for all, in the form of making sure that pensions are looked at, and we are looking at pension security and income security as well.

The issue is very broad and very concerning and I do share with the member those concerns of the people who are now, unfortunately, reaching retirement. It is very unfortunate that no other government considered those problems of women and immigrant women and people of disadvantaged groups. We are trying to make sure that that does not happen in the future. I thank the member for sharing those concerns with me.

Mr Sorbara: Bring us the bills.

Mr Mahoney: I did not hear an answer. As my colleague says, bring in some legislation. It is fine that the minister shares the concern, but I would like to take her back to our delightful time in estimates when I asked her about this issue. I asked her if she was prepared indeed to attempt with her government, convince her colleagues, to amend the Human Rights Code to prohibit the mandatory retirement that is there now as it particularly affects seniors and female seniors.

I just would quote to her where she said in answer to my question: "Yes, I am interested in amending the Human Rights Code. The code does not reflect today's society in many cases and in many areas." She went on to say, "Perhaps my advocacy role is working if I am able to bend the ears and to have people look at different arguments for mandatory retirement." Is the minister in fact

acting as an advocate at the cabinet table for this? Is she prepared to bring in legislation that will indeed amend the code, and when will she do it?

Mr Sorbara: Not just nice words.

Hon Ms Ziemba: The member does not want nice words. I will try to answer the question very succinctly with some nice words, though. We are concerned, yes. As I said before and previously, yes, I am an advocate at the table and I am prepared to do that. We are concerned and it is a big issue. We are looking at redefining the code because it has not been addressed in a very, very long time. That review is coming up and we will be continuing to look at when we will be reviewing the code.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Villeneuve: My question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Last week the federal government responded by providing funding for the net income stabilization account program. The Premier has told our farmers that he does not intend to implement the NISA program. Now that the federal government has reduced the premium to both the province and the farmers, will he change his mind and look at this in a positive light?

Hon Mr Buchanan: I think the question probably has two parts to it. The member talked about reducing the premium for the province. The federal government offered to reduce the provincial share for next year; it did not offer any reductions for this year, so in terms of what moneys we have available at this time, the answer is still the same as it was before.

Mr Villeneuve: I am sure the minister knows our farmers are very disappointed. They are facing another year of reduced commodity prices, and the federal government—and he has attacked it many times—has reduced the premium. They have reduced the cost to both the farmer and the province. Will the minister not reconsider, when times are as tough as they have ever been in farming? Will he not reconsider and at least give them a little break?

Hon Mr Buchanan: I would like to draw the member's attention to the fact that immediately upon becoming the government we did a review across the province and we talked to farmers about what their needs were. We had a financial review team put together that brought back recommendations. I would remind the member that the first thing the farmers wanted was some short-term relief in terms of interest rates. The second thing they were looking for was some long-term interest-rate relief. We have delivered \$50 million of provincial money—short-term immediate relief for farmers.

If we had looked at funding the NISA program, that would have been significantly less than \$50 million. We have given the farmers their number one priority and we think we have really gone a long way to helping farmers in this province.

CHILD CARE

Mrs McLeod: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. I think the members of

the Legislature are well aware that the Metropolitan regional council is considering an increase in child care fees in order to meet the rising costs of child care.

I wonder if the minister would give an indication of whether or not she is concerned that any proposal to increase parental fees for child care in Metropolitan Toronto will in fact render child care in Toronto unaffordable and, if so, how she would respond to this?

Hon Ms Akande: Actually, the member is quite right. We are in fact very concerned about even the possibility that Metro would implement an increase in fees, and we have conveyed that message to Metro as well as to several of the child care centres. We are continuing to work with Metro towards looking at some solutions which might make it possible for it to solve its situation and at the same time not increase fees to parents, which would make child care very difficult for some of them to access.

1520

Mrs McLeod: I wonder if the minister would be prepared to share with the members of the House what her definition of "affordability" in child care might be. If we were looking at housing and affordability in housing, there is a definition by which we establish what is considered to be affordable.

Would the minister share with us her definition for affordability in child care and indicate to us whether or not, if that definition of affordability cannot be met, we are likely to face a crisis of access and affordability in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon Ms Akande: The member knows, of course, that affordability is relative to income and we recognize that as the member did in the previous government. We have looked at affordability in a general sense as being available to people who make an income so that they are not discomforted in any way, or have to go without child care in order to pay for it, or do without other things. That, of course, makes it necessary for us to discuss with Metro how, in effect, that relationship and that funding relationship might be better effective, so that the services to parents are affordable and accessible. In order to do that we have focused on a redesign of the way we provide child care within this province.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that notwithstanding standing order 94(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot item 16.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

POLICE SERVICES

Mrs Mathyssen: I have a petition signed by 408 citizens of the town of Parkhill who respectfully request that the Legislature of Ontario not approve any proposals to close the OPP detachment in the town of Parkhill, abandon the plan for community policing, approve an increase of the complement of officers from four to five to ensure a

24-hour police presence, and that a sergeant in charge be appointed to the Parkhill detachment. I have signed my name to this petition.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Brown: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have a number of constituents who have signed this petition and I have affixed my signature.

ST GREGORY SEPARATE SCHOOL

Mr Stockwell: I have a petition signed by approximately 900 residents of the city of Etobicoke which reads as follows:

"To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas the St Gregory separate school in Etobicoke has been petitioning the Metropolitan Separate School Board for funding for much-needed renovations and expansion since 1982; and

"Whereas under new government guidelines, the list of new schools to be built and schools to be renovated were combined; and

"Whereas the combining of these lists has resulted in St Gregory being bumped from the number two position for funding in 1992 to the number six position; and

"Whereas our children are being denied equal opportunity for modern education because of a building that cannot support the size and needs of the students;

"Therefore, as concerned parents from the St Gregory area, we respectfully request that further consideration be given to St Gregory separate school in Etobicoke for immediate funding to rectify this inequitable situation."

NURSING HOMES

Mr Brown: I have another petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, and it addresses the underfunding of provincial nursing homes, and again I have affixed my signature.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

House in committee of the whole.

RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION
AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

Resuming consideration of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Section 9:

The Chair: Pursuant to the special orders of the House, call in the members for the deferred divisions on Bill 4. I would remind members that this is a five-minute bell.

1532

The committee divided on Ms Poole's amendment to subsections 100b(1) and (2), which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes—33

Nays—67

The committee divided on Mr Tilson's amendment to subsections 100b(1), (2), (3), and (4), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Tilson's amendment to subsection 100e(1), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on Ms Poole's amendment to add clause 100e(2)(f), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on Mr Tilson's amendment to add clauses 100e(2)(f) and (g), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add clause 100e(2)(g), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add clause 100e(2)(h), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Progressive Conservative amendment to add clause 100e(2)(h), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Progressive Conservative amendment to add clause 100e(2)(i), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add subsections 100e(8a), (8b) and (8c), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Progressive Conservative amendment to add subsection 100e(8a), which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add section 100ga, which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Progressive Conservative amendment to add section 100ia, which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to section 100n, which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Progressive Conservative amendment to section 100n, which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add section 100ta, which was negated on the same vote.

The committee divided on the Liberal amendment to add section 100tb, which was negated on the same vote.

The Chair: Shall section 9 carry? Same vote reversed?

Section 9 agreed to.

Bill ordered to be reported.

1540

RESIDENTIAL RENT REGULATION
AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

Mr Cooke moved third reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Hon Miss Martel: I would ask for unanimous consent of the House to split the time for third reading among the three parties.

Agreed to.

Hon Mr Cooke: Since there is agreement that the time will be split, rather than making extensive opening comments, I think I have the opportunity to sum up at the end of third reading and I will make my comments then.

Ms Poole: I am pleased to participate in the debate on behalf of the Liberal caucus. When the minister introduced this legislation he said that this legislation had the purpose of protecting tenants. Today, in this Legislature, we have to ask whether this bill has accomplished that goal, and I will say unequivocally that I do not think that Bill 4 protects tenants.

The minister may say that tenants are pleased right now because of the rent freeze, and initially he is right. Of course tenants are going to be pleased by the fact that their rents will be frozen for the next year or two, but there will be a price paid by tenants down the line because what this government has failed to realize and failed to understand is that tenants care for more than just their rent increases.

Of course rents are important to tenants, but of equal priority is the fact that tenants want a decent place in which to live. We are talking about tenants' homes here. They do not want to live in a building that is in a sad state of disrepair and they do not want to live in a slum, yet Bill 4 totally fails to address concerns about declining maintenance and ongoing neglect of our buildings.

The NDP has made absolutely no provision for major capital repairs even if the structural soundness of the building is in jeopardy, even if the health or safety of the tenants is in jeopardy and even if large numbers of the tenants agree. This is a myopic viewpoint which will not serve tenants or our aging housing stock well.

Bill 4 totally ignores the state of our aging rental housing stock. We have heard in this House before that 80% of our buildings in Ontario today are over 15 years old, and when we take it to the 20-year mark then almost two thirds of our buildings are 20 years old. When they get to that age, boilers start to give way, roofs need to be replaced, plumbing has to be redone, underground parking garages are deteriorating, balconies are corroding and electrical wiring needs to be replaced, and yet Bill 4 has made no provisions to continue these major repairs.

The Liberal Party put forward reasonable, sensible amendments which would protect tenants in the important areas of repairs and maintenance, even during the period of the rent freeze, but they have been rejected by the minister, who has said that he does not want to "gut" his bill. That is a quotation. Now I will tell members about our amendments regarding repairs and maintenance and leave it to them to decide where his bill would be gutted.

First of all, we said that there would be a provision for major repairs if they were necessary, necessary to the structural integrity of the building or to the health and safety of the tenants, or if two thirds of the tenants in the building agreed that the work should be done. On top of that, we capped it so that there could only be a 5% increase above the guideline. At the same time, we said that if they were neglecting the building the rent increase could be reduced, or in fact eliminated altogether, and we followed this up with a provision that the quality of the repair had to be considered. Surely the minister cannot report that this would gut his bill.

Or look at our amendment on maintenance. We wanted to enforce maintenance by broadening the powers of the standards board so that when landlords ignored work orders tenants can automatically deduct the guideline amount without having to go through the cumbersome rent review process. I cannot see how this government can claim to be pro-tenant and yet vote against these amendments which protect tenants.

Another pro-tenant amendment rejected by the government related to costs no longer borne, and to explain costs no longer borne I will give an example. Under our amendment, if the cost of a new fridge or stove was included in a rent increase, when those appliances were finally paid off then the amount of the rent increase would be deducted from the tenant's rent, again a very strong tenant-protection measure. I cannot comprehend how this minister and this government can claim they want to protect tenants and vote against this amendment, and yet they just did.

I feel that one of the saddest things about Bill 4 is that the NDP's heavy-handed approach has alienated major sectors of the housing industry—not only landlords but workers in the trades, suppliers, renovators, investors and financial institutions. Hostility between landlords and tenants has deepened to such an extent that I have never seen the like before. This does not bode well for tenants in this province. Already some landlords are threatening to withdraw services and maintenance because of their extreme bitterness over Bill 4. Trust in government has never been lower. The retroactivity of Bill 4 has put yet another nail in the coffin of trust in government and individual rights.

I am going to quote from a famous democrat who happened to be a Republican, Abraham Lincoln, and I hope that the minister will pay heed to this. Abraham Lincoln said:

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

What this minister and this government have done with their very controversial Bill 4 is jeopardize their credibility on the long-term legislation. In my own riding we had a meeting recently where the police had to be called in to prevent a riot, a riot because landlords and tenants could not even communicate in the same room without their bitterness overcoming their common sense.

1550

I feel that Bill 4 is symptomatic of what is wrong with this NDP government. The first thing is that, being socialist, they will not be content until they have completely destroyed the private sector. We will start with housing. When the Premier was Leader of the Opposition, he said publicly that the private sector had no place in the housing arena. When asked how he was going to get the one million units out of private hands, he said: "Well, we'll tighten up the restrictions. We'll make it so tight that the landlords will squawk and get out."

That is exactly what they are attempting with Bill 4. I think that it is shown that the Premier still feels that way today. This Premier exempted his ministers who own rental property from the conflict-of-interest guidelines because he did not feel that apartment buildings constituted a business interest. I think that tells members where the Premier is coming from.

But they are not going to stop at trying to force the private sector out of housing. They are also now trying to force out the private day care operators, in spite of the fact that they make up 34% of this province's day care units. They are trying to force them out and leave us in even more devastating straits with our child care system. Take auto insurance, another policy where this government's intent is to get it fully into the hands of the public sector, one more attack on the private sector.

It is not going to stop there. They will be after the nursing home industry. What is next? The financial institutions? Where is this government going to stop? Will it be able to stop? Will it be willing to stop before it has destroyed the private sector in this province? I sincerely doubt it.

The second reason that Bill 4 is symptomatic of what is wrong with this NDP government is that socialists do not consult. They do not need to consult, because they have all the answers and they are always right. In Bill 4 they said they would have public hearings, but what a mockery, what a sham. There was no consultation. They did not listen, they cut off the lists, they turned away groups. They did not want to hear from the people of Ontario, because this is the NDP's, the socialists' version of consultation: "We tell you we're consulting, therefore it is so."

But they did not listen and they did not open their minds, and they are not going to stop here, because the consultation for the long-term legislation is just as much a mockery: six weeks for the consultation period with the public before they went ahead, sending out a million questionnaires across the province, and yet at the same time well into the draft legislation, even before the consultation period had ended.

I will tell members their attitude on consultation is not limited to Bill 4 and the long-term legislation. We have seen how they consult just recently, when they abolished the oath of allegiance for police officers. No consultation, no debate, sneaky, backhanded, behind the scenes, with no regard for tradition. It is utter hypocrisy to approach it in this way.

The final hypocrisy was when the news carried a story of the Premier on Friday night at a citizenship court, reading out the same oath of allegiance to the Queen that he had disbanded this very week for police officers. How he could do that and retain any integrity, I do not know.

Mr Mahoney: He's got principles. If you don't like them, he's got others.

Ms Poole: That is right. The Premier has principles. If you do not like them, he will find some others.

A second example of the hypocrisy is when the Premier announced his conflict-of-interest guidelines with much fanfare, with much media attention. However—

Mr Wiseman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I can recall a speech made on this side of the House a few months back, where the word "hypocrisy" was used and where the member for Bruce got up and raised a long point of order, on the use of the word "hypocrisy" and having accused people of hypocrisy and that this word was considered to be unacceptable in this House at that time. I would hope that consistency would reign and that this word would not be allowed in the House at this time.

The Deputy Speaker: Just for your information, the word "hypocrisy" is not a word which is taboo in the House; the word "hypocrite" is.

Ms Poole: Mr Speaker, would you please have one minute restored to the clock because of their intervention?

To go on with the hypocrisy of the Premier, who announced with much fanfare his plans for conflict of interest and yet on 12 February sent a quiet little memo to the NDP members saying, "Don't worry about that statement I made publicly. You really don't have to do what I said you had to do," he changed the rules, but that is what Bill 4 has done, changed the rules in midstream without notice, without fairness, without decency.

The third way in which the socialists have problems is that they feel they are acting for the common good. Now I hasten to add that it is their definition of the common good. In their charge to act for the common good, under their terms, of course, they are quite willing to ignore the rights of the minority. They are quite willing to trample on the rights of the individual, because they do not count. They are acting for the common good.

It is interesting to compare how acting for the common good by the unions has resulted in massive layoffs in this

province. The unions, with Stelco, with Algoma Steel, with others, they went to the wall for their people. They got the best deal possible. They got a wonderful deal for the union, but once the negotiations were over, were settled, lo and behold, hundreds of workers were laid off because the company could no longer afford to pay these wonderful benefits. That is the NDP acting for the common good. Unfortunately, when acting for the common good they also tend—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would you stop the clock for a minute. I just want to clarify something so that abusive words are not used too frequently.

Hon Mr Pouliot: Well, with respect—

The Deputy Speaker: Let me finish, please. So that words are not used to raise the ire of the members, one has to be very careful. Let me explain. I said the word "hypocrisy" was acceptable; "hypocrite" was not. But if you say, "Hypocrisy on the part of the Premier," in my opinion this is offensive. If you say, "That is hypocrisy against the member for Yorkview," this, in my opinion, is offensive. I hope that is clear. What I want you to recall, or to keep in mind, is that whenever you use a word which is offensive, the Chair has the prerogative to say, "I don't like it," as simple as that. Please do refrain from using these words.

Ms Poole: Do the members know the most bitter irony? It is the fact that they call themselves the New Democratic Party. It should be the non-democratic party, because socialism has never borne any relationship to democracy. I will tell members, this government is proving that it still does not bear any relationship to democracy.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Ms Poole: I will give members an example of how this government treats democracy. The Minister of the Environment for this government said that even if Metropolitan Toronto has a deal with a northern Ontario municipality, even though both parties are willing, even though the deal will be beneficial to both parties, Metro may not ship our garbage to Kirkland Lake. It did not invoke this same provision for any other municipality, but just to Metro. Metro must do what this government dictates, no matter what the democratic situation is.

But then socialists have never tried to look for fairness and balance. In fact, this very minister, in this very House, was very upset with me back when we gave our initial speeches on Bill 4. He said, "You're arguing points on both sides, points for the landlords and points for the tenants." He said, "Get off the fence." I said to him, "I will make no apologies for being balanced, for looking at the holistic picture, for saying we can protect tenants and at the same time protect the stability of the housing industry." I do not see those two points as being mutually exclusive.

1600

But then again, the socialists never let respect for the law and respect for tradition get in their way. Those are just things that are out there. They have no meaning to people as far as this government is concerned. With their retroactivity they have said to people: "We don't care what

the law was. We don't care that you were acting within the law at the time that you spent money on the capital repairs and were assured of being reimbursed. We are now going to bankrupt you. We are going to put the small landlords out of business, because we have decided that the law will change and that the law will change retroactively."

As one of our presenters, the clearing house, the Housing Help Centre for Hamilton-Wentworth, said, "Retroactivity is always dangerous and rarely justified." Yet this government has tried to justify it by saying: "Well, it helps a large group of people. Therefore, it doesn't matter if we have trampled on the rights of the minority."

I do believe it matters. I believe that in this House we have a right to protect the rights of the individual and the rights of the minority. I believe that we have a right to be fair, that we have a right to be balanced. I believe that even though this is interim legislation, there should be justice in this legislation, and there is not.

I wind up my comments with a quote from Winston Churchill, another great democrat. He wrote: "The inherent vice of capitalism is the unequal sharing of blessings. The inherent virtue of socialism is the equal sharing of miseries." This government will not be satisfied until this whole province is steeped in misery.

Mr Bisson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I was asked by the government House leader to indicate and remind the Chair that there will be no questions after this, we have divided the time equally.

The Deputy Speaker: Yes. Just for the benefit of the member for Oriole, no questions or comments after the member has spoken.

Mr Turnbull: We have indeed spent a lot of time debating this issue, but relative to many important pieces of legislation that have come before this House, historically it has not been a great amount of time.

When this legislation was referred to the standing committee on general government, it was agreed that we would have five weeks of public hearings. This was successively cut back to three weeks of public hearings, even though we had 150 delegations wanting to make presentations with their views. These were both tenants and property owners.

We found that during the committee stage, I made a motion to have a representative of the Trust Companies Association of Canada come forward and speak to this legislation and explain the kind of impact this would have on values of properties and the impact on mortgaging. We have indeed seen the ravages of the collapse of the savings and loans in the United States and we are beginning to see some of the cracks that are occurring in our financial system.

This piece of legislation has wiped off 25% to 30% of the value of property, but the issue is not just whether values have been reduced. The issue, the core issue that indeed I think the New Democratic Party thought it was addressing when it brought forward this bill, was the issue of the need for affordable housing, and I think we must all be fair to the party inasmuch as it honestly had put this forward as its platform in the last election. The thing that we must strenuously disagree with their party on is its

solutions and the implications for what this will do in the province for affordable housing.

We recognize that 30% of all of the tenants in Ontario cannot afford the rent they are paying now, and there is nothing in this bill which does anything whatsoever to address that issue. I see in my own constituency office people coming in who are in dire straits, and yet every day we read in the newspapers about abuses of the welfare system.

There seems to be a strange contrast between these two issues, but the reality is we are not addressing the core issue of housing, which affects everybody. It affects the question of people going to food banks. The solution will certainly not be this approach to affordable housing.

We have seen time allocation put on this bill, which means that we are denied the chance to fully debate the various amendments the Conservative Party put forward and the Liberals put forward, and we have seen that at all turns all of these amendments have been voted down by the governing party.

This is a party which ran in the last election on a platform of open government, of consultation. Well, we have seen the kind of consultation there has been. There have been meetings set up where our party has been allowed to come but not participate in the meeting; they could not speak at the meeting. This is consultation. That is not the kind of thing that I understood under consultation.

We know that the housing stock in this province needs approximately \$10 billion worth of renovations, and at least \$7 billion of that should be spent by the year 2000, but we are not getting this renovation done because the landlords have stopped doing any renovations because they cannot afford to do this. Clearly there are some property owners who can afford to do renovations, but there are a great deal of them cannot.

In the depositions from the Ministry of Housing officials, it was very clearly put forward to us that indeed the legislation, right back to the time that the Conservatives brought the first rent control legislation in, never contemplated that major capital costs would be included in the basic rent. It would always be an amount that would be assessed after the fact and added on. Many landlords had been encouraged by the existing legislation, Bill 51, to go forward with major and much-needed renovations, and they had expended literally hundreds of millions of dollars, and the only way that they could get that money back was by first substantially completing the work and then making an application.

I would suggest that this is a fraud that has been perpetrated against the property owners. They had been promised that they could get this money back if they did the work, and now we see retroactive legislation.

The existing legislation was indeed flawed. We know that. But I do not believe in just totally ignoring the benefits of the legislation. You try to improve it. This party, the NDP, has done nothing to improve it. They have just tried to gut the legislation.

Yet the total contradiction of what they are doing is that they are saying landlords who have spent money under Bill 51 will not be able to get their money back that

they expended, and yet we are being told at the same time that under the permanent legislation they will be able to reap. So the tenants who thought that in some way the NDP was protecting them indeed see they are not. All they are doing is they are playing political games, and the political games are going to cost the life savings of many small investors.

1610

We heard during the committee hearings that many of the landlords in this province had put their life savings into small apartments, where typically there were only four or six units, and indeed these people have their life savings, all of their pension fund, tied up in it, and they are now being told: "Forget the money you've spent. You will lose it." We have seen the Premier go on record as saying that there will be a huge squawk, that they will reduce the housing values, and that if they do not like it, the NDP will buy them out. Yet when they have been asked to buy the landlords out, at substantially reduced prices, the government refuses to do that.

We have seen defaults on mortgages on a massive scale, and indeed this province has never seen the number of power of sale transactions on apartment buildings as we are seeing today.

There has been no move by the government to eliminate the backlog of those tenants who are waiting to find out whether they are going to have an increase with respect to previous applications. The very thing that the NDP used to say was reprehensible: They have done nothing to get the Ministry of Housing to get rid of that backlog.

We have seen that in fact the average renter in this province only pays 17% of his household income on rent, and yet we have the situation that we have this total, all-embracing legislation which seeks to protect every single tenant and at the same time blocks renovations to buildings at a time when we would never have a better opportunity to have inexpensive renovations. Workers are out of work. People who have been doing renovations for years are now laid off, the very people the government says it represents, and indeed it is denying them the ability to work, the workers.

What is the Conservative solution to housing? The Conservative solution is to make sure we help the most needy, that 30% of people who are paying more than a third of their total household income, who cannot afford the rent they are paying now. We would address that as a matter of urgency instead of trying to help people who are paying only 17% of their household income, and in order to arrive at an average of 17%, given that a large number of people, 30%, are paying more than a third of their income, we know that many households are paying substantially less than 17% average of their income. How can you possibly say these people are in need? Let's address the true needy of this province. At a time that we have more and more people attending food banks, the NDP is trying to get some political points at the expense of the property owners instead of addressing the true needs.

This is very disappointing legislation. This is the only major piece of legislation that the NDP has brought in in the six months that it has been in power, and it is totally

flawed. Even the Liberals, who never know whether they are socialists or what, are complaining and saying this is wrong.

How can they bring such legislation forward? Shame on them, and shame on them over the fact that they do not address the needs of tenants who are in need. We believe that they should urgently address this, instead of destroying the whole of the private housing sector, and that is indeed what they are doing. The message that this sends overseas and to the United States and to other provinces as to what this government will do to the private sector is awesome.

This indeed is a strike at the very way we govern people, because retroactive legislation has been brought in before, as we have heard, but it has usually been one or two or three months retroactive. There are aspects of this legislation which are retroactive four years. How can anybody order their business affairs if they can see that retroactivity can reach back four years? They will drive all investment away from Ontario, and indeed we are already seeing this. This is socialism at work, and speaking as someone who escaped the ravages of British socialism, I do not want it to happen here.

Ms Harrington: I would like to briefly address three different aspects that have been raised in this House in the last while: first, the need for Bill 4; second, the proposal I have heard over and over, "Let's have a market system"; and third, the question of fairness.

I have with me a report, the annual report from the Rent Review Hearings Board, and at the top of this report it says, "Law is an ordinance of reason for the common good, made by him or her who has care of the community."

I would like to let members know what the author of this report is saying very directly to this government and also to the previous government with regard to rent review.

"Neither landlords nor tenants are enamoured of the legislation." This is dealing with the RRRRA. "This observation is not a figment of the imagination of this chairman, it is publicly acknowledged reality. The infinite complexity, inadequacy and inconsistencies of the act are a daily staple for the board members" who have to deal with it. This law resulted in a "horrendously convoluted, time-consuming and confusing program that make both the parties and practitioners unhappy....This high level of dissatisfaction cannot be allowed to continue....When a piece of legislation intended to be an instrument of common good results in an uncommon level of anxiety, anger and accusations, there is no option but to resolve the issues" without delay.

This is from the chairman of the Rent Review Hearings Board.

I would like to comment further from this paper as to what the chair has said. If members listen carefully it says it all:

"Out-of-town, offshore, nameless, faceless landlords are not exceptions. Neither all investors nor all property managers are concerned for the buildings' or tenants' well being....There is a concern that tenants are paying off a building for a landlord and subsidizing flip transactions, while not being considered at all when the profits from

sales are taken." Every person in this House or across this province who owns a home knows what we are talking about. If you put money into the property, then you get that money out when you sell it.

I would like to go on and possibly translate that into language that might make you understand a little bit better. This is from one of the tenants who came to appear before our committee:

The RRRA, what we are talking about, why we have Bill 4, "was supposed to solve the problems of the previous legislation...but it became an instrument of social injustice," if members can understand that, "one of the most glaring examples of that injustice, the financial loss provision." When a building changes hands, what happens? The rents escalate "and become unaffordable while the neglected building continues to deteriorate. With each passing year of iniquitous phase-ins, the tenants pay more and receive less. This is downright wicked." This "provision is tantamount to a licence to steal. This moratorium...has, in effect, revoked the licence to steal and if there is any justice left in this world, it will remain revoked for all time."

That is why we have brought in Bill 4. Let me go ahead to discuss the question I have heard raised by the previous member, "Why not have a market system, the answer to all our woes, a market system?"

First of all, the United Nations declared that housing is a right—and this was way back in 1948—it is not merely a market commodity. I believe all the members of this House understand that. People will say, and I have heard it said, "It is a business." I ask members, what percentage of other businesses fails in the first five years? I think members would agree that a substantial portion of businesses, whether they are clothing stores, a corner dry cleaner or a convenience store, runs a risk in the first few years of failure.

In this particular business, if you call it a business, a person is guaranteed not to fail through the existing legislation we have had in place.

1620

I also have heard from various people. They were talking about the housing supply. If you look at the history of how government has been involved, it is not widely recognized that government has played a very large role in housing for the past 40 years. Through tax expenditures and direct subsidies, billions of public dollars have been pumped into what some call a business, into private housing markets. I am saying it is not a business, it is not an open market, it has not been for the past 40 years.

In the last 25 years, more than 200,000 units of private rental housing have been built directly through public subsidies and tax expenditure programs. They created housing for middle-income earners and offered trust benefits that flowed to the upper-income earners. If you think back over the last 10 years and the amount and direction of subsidies from the federal level, etc, members can understand what I am talking about, that these private markets were subsidized and that the benefits of that go to those who have.

I would like to leave with members that we do have a regulated market. It is not regulated for the benefit of the business community, it is regulated for the benefit of the

consumer, just like any other consumer protection legislation, for instance, environmental regulations, the Building Code Act; all of these are regulations to help the consumers.

I would like to go on to the question of fairness. This has been said a lot: "Bill 4, we understand what you're trying to do, but it goes too far. It is not fair." That is what we have heard.

I would like to quote from one of our presenters: "To be honest, my first impressions of the retroactivity were that, no, it was not fair. However, as I began to think about it," and I ask you to think about it, "neither is it fair for tenants to be faced with huge rent increases based on unnecessary repairs." Is it fair that legislation "gives women and minorities precedence for government jobs"? Is it fair that there are minority hiring quotas for the police force? "It doesn't have to be fair; it has to be just." We all agree, life is not fair. "In order to right a wrong that has been allowed for several years, the scales of justice may have to be weighted" the other way.

Fairness: I would like to quote from one further presenter. "A million tenants have had their lives and their pocketbooks trashed by this abomination known as rent review, so tell me if that is fair. Is it fair that children go hungry so the rent can be paid? Is it fair that the beleaguered taxpayers of this province are being asked to subsidize the greed of landlords through the rising shelter cost in the social assistance programs? The least unfair thing of all is any government action that will bring a speedy and permanent end to this travesty with which tenants have been beset for so long."

There is one further consideration I would like to mention just briefly, and that is shelter allowances. We have been told that shelter allowances are what we need, and I would like to let members know what the outcome of that would be. Let's provide tenants who experience affordability problems with direct government assistance to pay their new fair-market rents. The cost of such an approach would be enormous. Based on the 1986 census, implementing a universal shelter allowance at that time would cost \$1.2 billion to \$1.3 billion.

Okay, the replacement of new units is approximately three times higher than average current rents. To make investment viable, existing rents would have to be raised substantially. As rents increase, the subsidy cost has to increase, and also, as the rents increase, the number of people affected who would therefore be needing a rent subsidy would also increase.

Conservatively, the estimate would be the current cost for the shelter allowance system: between \$3 billion and \$4 billion annually. That is what you call an ever-growing financial black hole and that is what the Conservative Party would be advocating.

Mrs Caplan: As I rise to participate in this debate today, I would note that I believe there is insufficient time for me to fully represent the interests of my constituents. In the riding of Oriole, over 48% of the people are tenants and live in rental accommodation and I would say that my constituents are concerned. They are concerned because of this Housing minister's defensive position, one which I

would say still has been in an opposition mentality mode, as over and over again he has spoken about widespread abuse of the existing system. I would just like to set the record straight in the few minutes I have.

It is interesting to note that the minister constantly quotes rental increases of 150% or 200%, when the facts are that those increases of over 100% under the existing system have been one twelve thousandth of 1%. Yes, there have been some. Those are of concern and I believe things could have been done to address that, but for the minister to stand in his place day after day and speak of abuse suggests that the minister is perhaps being a little defensive and his rhetoric is not speaking to the interests of the people of this province.

A fact: Under the existing rent review system, 5.8% was the average increase across this province last year. The average increase for those rental buildings which went to rent review was 11%, and I know that was of concern to some tenants, but it was not 150%; it was not 200%.

I am the first one to say that the existing rent review system was not perfect. As a member of this House who sat on the committee that reviewed that legislation, then called Bill 51, at some degree of intensity, I can say that during those committee hearings and after, we were the first ones to say that legislation required a review after five years to ensure that it was achieving its goals and its objectives. What did we find after five years? We found on average each year that 80% of the tenants in this province received rental increases that were at or below the guideline under the existing rental regime. I would say to the parliamentary assistant, who sits opposite and nods her head, that 80% is considered in our school system as first-class honours. That is an A, but it is not perfect, and I would agree with her much has to be done to improve a system which is only working at 80%.

I would also point out that Bill 4 does not do that and that the constituents in the Oriole riding are feeling deceived. They are feeling deceived because in the Agenda for People, which we have been referring to as the agenda for power, the people had expected something very different from the NDP government and from this Minister of Housing. I would say his credibility is at stake.

1630

They also are extremely disappointed that this NDP government and the Minister of Housing did not accept the very reasonable—extremely reasonable—amendment proposed by our very able critic, the member for Eglinton, the Housing critic for the Liberal caucus. She knows, as the Minister of Housing knows, that 80% of the rental buildings in the province of Ontario are at least 15 years old, and almost two thirds of them are over 20 years old. In my riding of Oriole, many of those buildings are in need of repair, and what I hear from the tenants over and over again is that they are concerned. They are not only feeling deceived by this minister and by this government about what their housing policy is as it affects rent control and rental buildings; they are also feeling deceived and concerned because they know that their buildings need to be maintained.

Over and over again we heard the concern of tenants who said: "We want a clean and decent place to live. We want a well-maintained building." I am concerned about my right to fully represent my tenants and the people in my riding, landlords as well, because of the closure motion that has been brought forward by this minister. I am concerned about that because in fact this NDP government talked about openness. It talked about its open-door policy, and when I tried to attend a meeting in my very own riding, the door was closed and I was denied the right to represent my constituents at a meeting that had been billed and had been advertised as a public consultation process.

I was not surprised when this government brought forward closure, because I had experienced what it meant by open-door and what it meant by public consultation. To be denied the right in this House to fully represent my constituents saddens and pains me. Once again the people of my riding and the people of Ontario have been deceived by this government that speaks about public consultation and open-door policy, because that is just simply not true.

Not only are the landlords in this province feeling deceived because of the retroactive nature of this bill, landlords who obeyed the previous law and in good faith began the needed renovations to the apartment buildings that they owned; the tenants are also feeling deceived, not only because of the Agenda for People, the agenda for power. The tenants in my riding—

Mr Owens: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Oriole is accusing the government of deceiving the public. I would respectfully request that she withdraw that remark.

The Acting Speaker: The member for Oriole did not accuse any one individual. The member for Oriole, I believe, is in order.

Mrs Caplan: I know there are some members of the government caucus who are very sensitive on this issue, because they are ashamed when they go back to their ridings and have to stand up and be accountable to their own electorate, who know what they said during the election and who know what they are doing now. But as we say in this House, that was then, this is now.

I would say that my constituents and the tenants in my riding have a number of concerns. I want to put them on the record, and then I will yield to my colleagues who wish to speak.

They are concerned about the hidden agenda of this government. Their concern is that this government wants to force out the private sector from many aspects of life in this province. Members heard the eloquent words of my colleague the member for Eglinton, who said it very well. Child care is another example, auto insurance another example and housing another example. People are concerned about building decay; yes, building decay. They are concerned about having hostile landlords made angry by this government and taking it out, unfortunately, on their tenants. Tenants are concerned and worried about that.

I do not believe that there is any landlord who would do that, but my tenants are worried and concerned that this might happen to them. But do you know what they are

most concerned about, Mr Speaker? They are concerned about being forced, because of the housing policies of this government, to live in government-run housing. They are concerned about being forced to live in slums. They are concerned, and I am here today to put their concerns on the record.

Not all of the tenants who live in Oriole riding want to live in government-run housing. They do not want to live in government-owned housing. They do not want to live in government-operated housing. They do not want the government of Ontario, the NDP government, to be their landlord. They want the right to choose. They want to live in well-maintained buildings. They want fairness for themselves and for their landlords. They want fair rents. They want a clean and decent place to live.

As I sum up, I will say on behalf of the constituents in the riding of Oriole that they do not believe Bill 4 is fair to landlords. They do not believe that Bill 4 is fair to tenants. They do not believe that it is in the public interest.

Mr Carr: I would like to add a few comments, if I could, in the limited time that we have available. I will try to be fairly brief in my remarks.

I want to cut through a lot of the rhetoric that has taken place over the last little while and cut right to the very heart of the problem, which I think is really to try to see how we are going to get more rental units in the province of Ontario. Unfortunately, this Bill 4 is not one way of doing it. In fact, Bill 4 is going to make sure that there are no more private-sector rental units built.

I want to get away from the rhetoric. I know there was a lot of rhetoric that came out as a result of some of the meetings. I know that the Housing minister said that he was allergic to landlords, and so on. I guess they must have interesting cabinet meetings, though. I suspect the Transportation minister, the Community and Social Services minister and the Citizenship minister must sit at the other end of the table from the Housing minister. Either that or there is a lot of sneezing and hacking going on during cabinet meetings. But I want to get away from the rhetoric, because I think that is not productive.

Unfortunately, Bill 4 destroys the ability to produce any more rental units in this province, and really that is what we need. We need more rental units in this province and we do not need legislation that is going to take more out of the marketplace.

I will reflect on what the Premier said in opposition, and I quote: "You make it less profitable for people to own it. I would bring in very rigid, tough systems for rent review. Simple. Eliminate the exceptions and the loopholes. There will be a huge squawk from the speculative community, and then you say to them, 'If you're unhappy, I will buy you out.'" I suspect that is what the agenda is. They want to take over and have the entire housing being run by the government, as opposed to having private-sector involvement.

In spite of the rhetoric, the Premier, when he was elected, went down to New York and said, "We'll be good and we're not going to move too fast." Then, whammo, he comes in with retroactive provisions, the like of which we

have not seen since the federal government under Trudeau did the same thing under the national energy policy.

I had a chamber of commerce that, when this government was elected, a socialist government, said: "Well, we're not going to worry. He's a bright guy. He won't move too fast." Now they are saying to me, "If he'll do this to one section of the business community, what will he do to us?" Retroactive provisions scare them, because money is very fluid. I know some of the members in the government side will not understand this, but money runs to the area of least resistance.

I can tell members, there will be no more money going into building any rental units in this province as a result of this bill. The government will have to do it. It is now going to be thrown back on to its shoulders to build the rental units that are needed here, and this is at a time when the Treasurer says we are broke, we have no more money. We are broke in this province. We have a deficit. We have no more ability to get any more revenue. We are completely flat broke in this province. Yet we are now taking a section of the community that could build some rental units and it will no longer be a part of it. It is going to fall back on the government, a government that is broke and in fact is worse than broke. We are now in debt, and that is climbing up.

How are these rental units going to be built? Well, I guess the money is going to have to fall out of the sky. We have competing interests. We have the Community and Social Services minister here who said we need more money for social programs. This is going to cut into the money for housing. We need more money in education. The 60% funding is going to go out. We have no money now. We have colleges and universities that need money. Some of the groups are asking for \$450 million over four years. All of the money is being squeezed.

1640

As the Premier said in the throne speech, we have to set priorities. So where are the priorities going to be with this government? "Throw out the private sector, and we're going to build them all." Well, I can tell the members, there is going to be no money to build and unfortunately the people who are going to suffer are going to be the people whom they really want to help the most. The tenants who are out there, the tenants who are hurting, are going to be further squeezed because we are going to have the situation where there are going to be no rental units built in this province. In the larger cities, we are going to have situations—it is already tight—where the market gets worse and we are going to have no place for people to live as a result of bills like this.

Unfortunately, the program under this bill is going to further kill the already dramatic situation that we have got. It is kind of ironic that when the government talks about the amount of increases that are needed, when it comes to government programs the subsidies that are needed are in the range of well over \$1,000 per unit. We are going to be in a situation where we are not going to be able to afford to build any more rental units. We are squeezing out the private sector, which could, and should, be part of the solution.

instead, what we do is we bring in the sledgehammer and knock them all out.

So unfortunately and I guess as politicians it is always easy to do, we look for short-term fixes to problems instead of long-term. Instead of planning and looking to the future and saying, "How are we going to create more rental units to alleviate the problem?" we are doing nothing to alleviate that problem and in fact we are looking at short-term—I suspect for political gains with one segment of the population—over long-term planning in this province.

What I say we need is to get away from the short-term fixes, which have not worked, and create more rental units which in the long term will help the very people that all three sides want to help. Make no mistake about it: all three sides—the government side, the two opposition parties—want to help the tenants. They want to make sure that there is safe, affordable housing in this province. Unfortunately, what Bill 4 will do is make it so that the only thing that is going to be built will be the government.

If we look at all the areas that the government gets involved in, whether it be the workers' compensation which gets backed up, the present rent review situation gets backed up, anything the government gets involved in unfortunately costs more and gives the people of this province less. As we reflect on this bill, unfortunately we are going to be in worse shape as a result of it.

I wanted to take a quick minute to talk about some of the small and medium landlords. These are the people who I think are most affected. I think even the Housing minister must be moved by some of the submissions by some of his group, because we are not talking about the very rich organizations; we are talking about some of the small people similar to, I guess, some of the cabinet ministers who are in the same situation.

There are a few of the people who came before some of the meetings I went to who talked about how they are virtually going to be destroyed as a result of this. I had one submission from one of the chaps in my riding whose father was about ready to retire. He is a small landlord who had this little piece of property. As a result, he is not going to be able to do that. The situation was that some of the rent was going to be passed on through. They had already gone and made plans upon that and now it is changed. This poor fellow is now in a situation where he is not going to be able to retire comfortably, and has had to go back to work in fact, and he is in the construction industry.

So with all the pleas and with all the talk about fairness, this legislation does not do anything for fairness. I guess when you reflect on it, my file in housing from the people is now getting rather large. I think it is my biggest file. When you read through it now, you read the submissions that are coming in from people who are saying they are being destroyed; they are basically going to be put out of business. You hear remarks that this Bill 4 is like a Scud missile or it was a stab in the back. There is a chap in North York who says he will lose his building. Another owner of one of the buildings now says his units are in a loss position as a result of the high financing costs.

So here we are looking at a bill that will do nothing to help these individuals. So unfortunately, instead of doing long-term planning, which I think is what the people want the government to do, we are looking at short-term cynical fixes to problems in order to appeal to special interest groups which in a lot of cases are the vocal minority. The strong leadership that needs to be taken is over the course of four years, saying, "Okay, long-term, how are we going to solve this problem?" Unfortunately this was a very bad first step with Bill 4.

I do not think we are going to change very many minds. I do not see anybody standing up over there with any revelations prepared to vote against this bill. But hopefully we will learn for the next process as we go around, that when you take a course of action there are going to be some fallouts from people. If they are still in business when we get into the next round, these are the people, the small and medium-sized businesses, who have been affected. I hope, and I think most members on the other side will try to listen to their input because it is very moving testimony and it has been on all sides. We have heard from some of the tenants who have had tremendous situations. What we have got to do is come up with some balance that is going to bridge the gap between the two. Unfortunately Bill 4 does not do that.

So let's learn our lesson from this. I do not think we are going to be able to change the minds of the members opposite, but let's learn for the next go-round that now that we are in government we have to look at everybody and how these implications in a bill are going to help or hurt some of the various segments of the population. In the end, what we need to do is have some long-term planning to really make sure that we have enough affordable rental units in this province so that the people of this province can be assured of having some safe and affordable housing. That is the goal. I think we sometimes lose that in the rhetoric. All three parties want that; all three parties want to be fair to the tenants. Let's, as the next process takes place, make sure that we look at everyone and try and really, which is what the government is supposed to do, take a long-term planning process and make sure that we do the right things.

So those, in the short time that we have, are a couple of my preliminary thoughts, and hopefully they will add to some of the discussions.

Mr Drainville: I must say that I do appreciate very much the comments made by the honourable member for Oakville South; very reasoned comments, albeit we are philosophically at different ends of the spectrum, but they were well reasoned and well presented. I cannot say the same for the honourable member for Oriole. I wish she was here, because when I was listening to her comments I was reminded of the statement by Mark Twain, who once said that you should find out the facts before you begin to distort them. It seems that fact after fact that was put forward was questionable. The position that she put forward indicating, for instance, that the tenants of her riding and of Ontario are ill-used and perhaps even abused by Bill 4 is just wrong, blatantly wrong.

I had the honour to sit on the committee of general government as we reviewed this legislation, and there is no question that there was great emotion on behalf of many people who came, and the tears that were shed were not just on the basis of those who were landlords, but the very real emotions that played across the faces of those who lived in inhuman living conditions in apartments was also there for us to see. No one should have to feel the need to come before a committee of this Legislature and feel that somehow he has no recourse left. So I felt terrible at those periods of time, as did every member on the committee.

There is no question that we come at this issue from a different philosophical standpoint and that our view is that tenants in the province of Ontario have been ill-served by the rent review legislation that has been in effect. Bill 51 was not a helpful piece of legislation. It did not prevent tenants from—dare I say it?—economic eviction.

Bill 4 will not solve that problem totally; I agree with the opposition. But it will ensure that a certain number of tenants will not have to see an increase in the immediate future in their rental increase. Now, for instance, we know that 330,000 tenants have been hit with increases above the guideline in recent history; 330,000 tenants.

Rent review, for instance, has contributed to more speculation. In 1989 there was a study done in the city of Toronto that indicated that 11% of the total rental stock had been sold twice or more in the period of 10 years. Now, when people have said that there was no flipping involved—they did not like the word “flipping”—there was flipping involved. There were people who were taking advantage of the system that was there and it was not illegal for them to do. It was not illegal, yet one questions the morality of it when it affected the daily lives of people who were living in those buildings.

1650

The opposition, in its discussions in the general government committee and in this House, has indicated—for instance, the member for Oriole just a few moments ago indicated that the Minister of Housing talked about those extreme cases of 110%, 120%, almost indicating, by implication, that that was our only concern. That is not our only concern. When the honourable member said that 11% was the average, if you are in poverty, if you are a sole-support mother, if you are a pensioner on fixed income, you cannot afford 11%, nor 15%, nor 20% or 25%, which was often the case in Ontario. That was untenable to this government. We did not accept it and we needed to implement immediately a moratorium on rent control.

Economic eviction is the free market at its worst. It is a human rights issue. We know, for instance, that right now in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in Canada, even though there is volition on the part of levels of government and on the part of people across the country that housing should be a protected right, it is not. It is not a protected right. Shelter or food or clothes or opportunity of employment are not rights in this country. There are no economic rights in the charter as such. The problem with that is that we will perpetually have the problems that we have in ensuring that the needs and aspirations of all Canadians

and Ontarians are taken care of until we are able to change that charter to ensure that there are those kinds of rights.

I want to say also that the opposition has spoken often about the fact that the problem is not that we have high rents, but that we have low incomes. Let's be clear about that. They have said on their part that the means by which we can redress these problems is to ensure that the government gives shelter subsidies. These shelter subsidies are going to cost a fortune and the suggestion is given to us by the very party which in Ottawa is cutting back on social program after social program. There is no room for that kind of subsidy.

One has to question also where that kind of idea comes from. It comes from an understanding that there should be no controls, that there should be no reviews, that the free market system should thrive. The question is, who is going to receive the benefits of that thriving? Not the poor, not the sole-support mothers, but rather those who have money, have influence and have apartments, and they are landlords. That is not acceptable any more.

I rest on that point and just say that the people of this province and the tenants of this province will be well served not only by Bill 4, but by the future legislation which is to come through from this government.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Bill 4 is simply bad legislation. Bill 4 is a bad bill. It is a bill that is not fair, a bill that is retroactive, a bill that has had incomplete public hearings, more people denied a hearing than those we heard, a bill that is indeed controversial and has been the focus of two major marches on this Legislature.

Bill 4 is a bad bill because it will no doubt cause a wave of insecurity throughout private-sector investment in rental housing. In fact, we have already seen, in the few short months since its introduction, loan defaults and bankruptcies among owners of rental properties across this province. Indeed, many investors are placing their capital outside the borders of our province of Ontario.

Bill 4 is a bad bill because it will accelerate the eventual decay and deterioration of Ontario's rental housing stock. Yes, affordable housing supply. Bill 4 makes it almost economically impossible for landlords to perform needed repairs and preventive maintenance.

Bill 4 is a bad bill because it will cause and has caused massive layoffs and perhaps permanent job losses in the related industries of construction, repair, renovation and related industries. These are already challenged by our tenuous economy.

Bill 4 is a bad bill because in the long term it will hurt the very tenants it proposes to help by creating a shortage of affordable accommodation for tenants and, in some cases, threatening the very structural integrity of their homes.

Bill 4 has driven down the value of many properties with affordable rents. Bill 4 has stolen many people's retirement incomes. Bill 4 put lenders at risk of default because of losses landlords cannot pay. Bill 4 has destroyed trust in legislation and in government. Bill 4 is not the kind of message I want to send to the people of Ontario who are searching for economic stability.

This bill has, as a very possible spinoff, the deepening of the recession whose effects are already being felt in many apartment-related sectors, and it will contribute to a reduction in the quality of the existing housing stock of future tenants and of present tenants.

I do not believe that the interests of government, tenants and the rental housing industry are irreconcilable. I do believe, however, that long-term solutions to this challenge will only be found by soliciting the active participation of all of the partners of housing—tenants, landlords, suppliers, contractors and government—consultations begun in an atmosphere of trust.

This government has not really listened or heard the small landlords of this province. They have not listened to the employers and workers in the renovation-restoration industry. They have not really examined facts and statistics.

The Hamilton Spectator, on 26 March in the midst of our hearings, said: "It was disappointing that the NDP used its majority in committee to reject a number of constructive Liberal amendments. The Liberals suggested, among other things, that landlords be entitled to pass on capital costs (subject to a cap of 5% above the guideline) if the work was needed to ensure the structural soundness of a building, protect tenants' health and safety, or where most tenants agree."

This positive suggestion was rejected outright by the NDP government. This government has not even considered the negative messages that have been sent to the business community by passing retroactive legislation on matters financial. The predictability, the ability to forecast our housing market is quickly slipping away. This government seems to be trying to ensure that the building and the building industry of rental accommodation quickly becomes an endangered species in Ontario. Investors are even now placing money outside of the housing market and/or beyond Ontario's borders. Bill 4 destroys business confidence in the rental housing industry. The present environment is not conducive to meaningful dialogue or full partnership in an industry that feels that it is being raped.

Yet you know, Mr Speaker, as I do, that the housing industry is essential to the prosperity of this province and the individuals in it. It is with regret that I see the rent control consultation paper, Issues and Options, out for comment, indeed when 5 April, the deadline, has passed, while we are still working on a bill in an environment of confrontation, uncertainty and instability, and when so many people in this province have so much to share with us on this important topic.

700

Mr Tilson: We have in the gallery this afternoon a person who has asked a number of very simple questions with respect to Bill 4. I would like to refer to some of them, because I think it sets the whole issue with respect to which the member for Oakville South talked and the concerns that he has. Those questions are: Why would a government pass such strict legislation to solve such simple problems as luxury renovations and high rent increases—that was the issue that was raised by the Minister of Housing—and why would it pass such strict regulations if that

is what it is trying to solve? The second question that he asked is, why would a government knowingly eliminate thousands of construction and renovation jobs, why would a government knowingly bankrupt property owners?

On the surface it certainly does not make sense as to why a government would do these sorts of things, and the government certainly knows full well that by eliminating thousands of construction and renovation jobs it will hurt the economy of this province and it will put many, many more out of work who are even working now. The real question is, why would the New Democratic Party government destroy the very people whom they are trying to help?

I think it was all said by the member for York South in 1989, when he spoke his famous words, which have been said, and I would like to emphasize these words: "You make it less profitable for people to own it," which of course is rental property. "I would bring in a very rigid, tough system of rent review. Simple.... There will be a huge squawk from the speculative community, and you say to them, 'If you're unhappy, we'll buy you out.'"

So there is the hidden agenda as to what this government does, because the Premier further stated, in this same interview, "You can't talk about rent review till you talk about the structure of ownership." Then he goes on to say, "We need a government program of purchase."

We have seen the start of it. We have seen the start as to what this government intends to do. They are going to make housing in this province a public utility.

These statements have been asked many times in this House, they have been asked at the committee level, they have been asked of the Minister of Housing, they have been asked of the parliamentary assistant, and the statements have gone undenied. There has been no qualification, there has been no retraction, so I assume that is the hidden agenda of this government.

With the Premier's quotes in mind, and the NDP hidden agenda when it becomes more apparent, the NDP does not seem to believe in private ownership of rental property. Clearly that is their intent. Uncompromising rent control legislation may have been designed to bankrupt property owners; the NDP's hidden agenda would have the tenants and the provincial government buy out the owners at fire sale prices. I submit that is what they are trying to do. They are going to force the values of land down and they are going to buy them out at fire sale prices.

Let's look again at the Premier's statement that he made in 1989, because I think this is very crucial as to the whole philosophy as to where this government is going, not only in Bill 4—and it is not too late to vote against it—but in the permanent legislation. "You make it less profitable for people to own it"—that is, rental property. Mission accomplished. It is already accomplished, and this government has done it.

Comparatively, rental property values have decreased 25%, and there are statistics out on that. The member for York South said, "I would bring in a very rigid, tough system of rent review." Well, that is almost done, and we see the lack of consultations that the member for Oriole

referred to, because that is certainly where we are going to go.

Again, the emphasis that, "There will be a squawk from the speculative community, and you say to them, 'If you're unhappy, we'll buy you out.'" Who will buy these people out? I will tell members who is going to buy it out—the taxpayers. The taxpayers have had enough of governments like this trying to tax them on large rent increases.

As a new member, I find it just a terrible thing that we have been forced to be muzzled by this government. I have about 12 summary objections to this. I am going to start, and I suspect that a last-gasp attempt to persuade this government to withdraw its bill or to vote against it will go unheeded, but I am going to try.

The most important factor that the people who came to the hearings were concerned with was the issue of retroactivity, and in our amendments we have suggested that that legislation should be on royal assent. This government appears to be, by some of the bills that it has been legislating, bringing in more and more retroactive legislation. Well, it is not fair. The people in this province have relied on the rules set by the previous legislation. Now it is broken. It is broken as a matter of contract and, I submit, will be broken as a matter of law, as will be proven in due course. Job losses and bankruptcies are prevalent as a result of what this government has done.

Now at first blush you would think it is retroactive to 1 October 1990; however, it is in reality retroactive to at least June 1990, when the applications for October had yet to be filed. In addition, all applications claiming financial loss since 1986 are subject to change retroactively because the balance of the outstanding phase-in orders is being voided, as are of course the conditional orders.

So this bill makes certain facts that have been consented to by the previous government, by the people of this province, void back to 1986. That, I say to the parliamentary assistant, is not fair and that is what the people of this province are saying, "Your legislation is not fair."

The second objection to this legislation has to do with the phase-ins. Financial loss allowances certainly have to be phased in over time, at no more than an extra 5% over the annual increase amount, until the loss power is entirely phased in. That, through the previous legislation, adopted by the people of this province and by the previous government, sometimes takes over five years. There are many buildings that have the orders that were issued some time ago, and they have not received full compensation for the benefit of those orders because the losses have not been completely phased in yet. They relied on the rules, and it is not fair because this government is making them void. The proposed Bill 4 voids all outstanding phase-ins, and that is not fair.

Third, this bill does nothing with respect to dealing with the problem of chronically depressed rents. It does not take into account the many rents that are already, as proven by the facts presented in this hearing, far below the fair-market value, as has been going around this province. Even though a purchaser may acquire a building for a fair market value, he will not be allowed to increase the rents

to enable him to support the fair cost of the complex. That is not fair.

the whole subject of devaluation has been referred to many times in the speeches of this House and during the committee level. However, with the proposed amendments, no purchaser will buy his building and no bank will finance against his building more than the current net income of the building multiplied by a capitalization factor. Therefore, many of these landlords will lose the equity they built up over time because the building will only be worth as much as their rents. That has been the problem, that people have to come us because the buildings are being devalued as a result of Bill 4. They cannot get any further money to put into capital improvements, because the banks will not give it. They cannot raise money for it and they cannot sell their buildings, because no one will buy them. So again, remember what the member for York South said in 1989, that he is going to buy out all the housing in this province. That is the plan. That is the hidden agenda.

This Bill 4 is creating slums in this province. Already, we have had, as has been referred to already this afternoon, the reference to substandard accommodations that have been all around this province, and we have heard of that specifically in the city of Toronto. When a landlord is faced with expensive work orders from the municipality on the threat of closure for failing to do the work, the landlord will waive the cost of complying, which is no longer recoverable through rent increase, with the cost of continuing to operate the building. In many cases, it will make more financial sense to allow the municipality to shut the building down.

It is the tenants who will suffer in this scenario, because the landlord is being discouraged from meeting standards, and landlord after landlord after landlord has told us they do not have the money to meet these standards that have been set by the province or set by municipalities, so the buildings will be shut down and there will be no accommodation because of Bill 4.

The subject of higher taxes has to be addressed. Certainly Bill 4, I submit, will result in hardship for the taxpayer. Eventually, since no buildings are being constructed and older buildings will continue to deteriorate, it will be necessary to provide an alternate source of housing. The Minister of Housing already realized this when he made announcements for capital grants to low-rise buildings, so he acknowledges the problem. I will bet that this Treasurer will put in his budget all kinds of money for non-profit housing. That is going to be paid for by the taxpayer, and yet there is nothing in this bill which will encourage the private enterprise to build new buildings, absolutely nothing. Eventually, all of this will be paid for out of the tax dollars and none of these matters will be paid for by itself.

The seventh objection has to do with the discrimination to the landlord. The proposed amendments, as I believe litigation will prove, are discriminatory against landlords. They introduce socialist measures by requiring services to be provided without a profit. However, unlike other socialized programs, such as OHIP, the cost is not being borne by the general taxpayer public yet. For the next two years

landlords are being forced to pay for this new system alone. It is similar to telling doctors, when OHIP first started, that they could not charge for their services.

710

Landlords as a group are being penalized for investing in rental income properties. In other words, landlords are being asked to pick up the problems of this province with respect to housing, as opposed to spreading it around over the entire system, and that is not fair and that is discriminatory.

The whole subject of capital expenditures was not dealt with adequately, either in the public hearings or in the committee of the whole. We tried to debate that subject and we were forced by closure to stop debating it. The proposed amendments do not allow for a landlord to improve the building. Capital expenditures have been disallowed entirely. There is nothing in Bill 4 that allows landlords to put forward capital expenditures. Tenants cannot even offer to contribute for improvements that they would like to see made to the building. For example, if tenants would like to have a security system, intercom and parking lights added to an older building for their own protection, the landlord cannot provide it unless he is prepared to give it as a gift. Not only are the tenants not allowed to contribute to the cost, even if they wanted to, but the landlord cannot even justify the expense as an improvement that will increase the value of the property itself, since the value of the property will now always be determined by its rents, not the fair market value of the physical asset.

Investment, both inside and outside this province, has been discouraged. We have had individual after individual come to us at the public hearings and say they he his interested in investing in this province with respect to housing, that he has lost faith in this province, he has lost faith in this government. There will be job losses, bankruptcies, foreclosures, and worse yet, absentee landlords as a result of foreclosures and other ways in which individuals who have no interest in housing will be taking over the housing industry.

The next objection I have is the windfall benefit to tenants. The proposed Bill 4 does not allow a landlord to provide additional services to the tenants for the building. For example, if a landlord must upgrade the Hydro service on an older building to comply with a work order, the utility commission usually insists on providing only one service to the building rather than the original separate meters. This means the landlord will have to take on the full cost of Hydro, which used to be paid by the tenants. Under the current legislation, the Bill 51 legislation, the landlord could simply obtain an increase that would maintain the status quo by adding the average monthly cost of Hydro to the rents. Under Bill 4 this is no longer possible and the tenants would get a windfall benefit at the expense of the landlord. I say to the parliamentary assistant, that is not fair either.

Finally, landlords are restricted in that Bill 4 restricts the landlord's ability to recover the rent money that is due. Under Bill 51, the current legislation, once an order is issued by the rent review services, all the moneys found due are payable as of the effective date of the order. The

effective date is usually some time previous to the date of the order, is actually issued because of the delays in processing the application. This means that the landlord frequently goes for months with the tenant paying the old rent for the minimum increase on the old rent when he is supposed to be getting compensated for his improvements or losses. Under Bill 4 the tenants will be given 12 months interest free to pay any money that they owe to the landlord. That is not fair.

There is the whole subject that I raised with respect to extraordinary operating expenses, and that has to do with one subject that I raised, garbage tipping fees. That simply seems to be going completely unnoticed or proceeded with respect to the Minister of Housing. We have asked him at committee, we have asked him at the committee of the whole level to deal with this subject, and he simply refuses to. Therefore, we have seen the policy of this Ministry of the Environment as to where it is going with garbage and how the whole subject of waste is going to be put on the buildings. The tippage fees are going to increase, and there is no question that will not be allowed to be passed on. The landlords will be forced to pay for that. Where are they going to get the money for these sorts of things? Where are they going to get it?

Then finally there is the whole subject of economic eviction, and I emphasize this as my final comment as to why Bill 4 should be defeated; 30% of the tenants of this province cannot afford any increases at all, and yet this government continues to perpetuate that problem. They do nothing for those people. They do nothing for the poor of this province. They are allowing those people to be forced to pay the rents that they have stated over and over—the seniors, the students of this province, seniors who are on a fixed income and who simply cannot afford the increases—are being put forward under Bill 4, yet there is nothing to assist those people, and yet they are literally going to be forced out on the street.

Those are the people who with Bill 4, at least when I listen to the Minister of Housing, when I listen to the parliamentary assistant, this government is trying to help. They are trying to help the people who cannot afford to pay the rents, and Bill 4 does nothing with that. They are trying to help the people, with respect, who are losing jobs. Bill 4 causes a loss of jobs. Bill 4 does nothing with respect to that. Yet the members sit and the government sits on its hands and simply says: "Sorry, we're not going to do anything. We're going to deal with it in the green paper and we'll be able to consult with that," even though, as the member for Oriole said, we are not allowed in many cases to speak, are not allowed to offer suggestions and there is no consultation process at all by this government, none whatsoever.

Mrs Caplan: It's a sham.

Mr Tilson: It is a sham. The member for Oriole has said it is a sham and that is an understatement. It is a sham.

As I indicated the other day, I was invited to attend one of the green paper hearings, but it was made quite clear to me that I was not allowed to attend and speak. I was allowed to go but I could not speak, and that is not fair.

When are we going to be able to offer a contribution to this government? We certainly have been closed out of these debates and we have been closed out of the green paper. My guess is that the final bill has already been prepared and there has been no debate whatsoever through the green paper process to offer suggestions to this government.

There has been no consultation. This bill is going to destroy the economy of this province and I recommend to all of the members that they vote against it. There is no logical reason why they do not vote against it, because fact after fact after fact has been submitted to us that this bill should be defeated. More evidence has come forward, and I am talking about hard, cold facts of all of this information, and we simply are not allowed to debate this any further.

I notice that my time is up. I have much more to say and I regret that under the rules I am not allowed to say that and the opposition is being muzzled.

Ms M. Ward: I rise to speak in support of Bill 4 and on behalf of my constituents. I believe that Bill 4 was necessary and is necessary to protect tenants from the deficiencies of the Residential Rent Regulation Act. That act has been a disaster for tenants, and that was no surprise to tenants. They predicted it when it was passed in 1986.

The increases that tenants have been subjected to, I believe, could almost be called criminal. In my riding of Don Mills, about 60% of the constituents live in rental accommodation. The increases that they have been subjected to are far in excess of their ability to pay in most cases.

A 39% increase is not a normal increase. This is a typical example, one of the apartment buildings in my riding where last year they had a 39% increase. In that building, I see dead mice in the stairwells, an elevator with lighting so inadequate that you can hardly see someone on the other side of the elevator with you. They were certainly not getting adequate maintenance for this level of increase.

That building—no surprise—had recently been sold. I think that is the worst situation that Bill 51 created. It encouraged flipping of buildings. Investors were encouraged to buy at a high price and they could pass that increase on to the tenants, and the tenants did not have the ability to finance the purchase of that building when the average wage increase, if any, might be 6% or so.

1720

One of my main concerns is with the seniors in my riding, which consists partly of East York. I share the borough of East York with my colleague the member for York East, and the other part of my riding is Don Mills. There is a very large number of seniors there on a fixed income. They certainly are not able to pay these increases of 20% to 40%.

There was much made of the fact that increases of 100% were not common. During our hearings we heard that frequently. Increases of 100% occurred only in some very small numbers of cases. I think the emphasis is on the wrong thing there.

An increase of 20% is too large. When you consider these compound year after year, even the average increase

of 11%, which I understand is the average increase that went through rent review, over three years you are looking at a major payout. If we look at a 20% increase on a rent of \$700, that is \$140.

When these increases are unpredictable, people are not able to plan for them. They do not know what increase they are going to get. Another deficiency of Bill 51, the RRRA, was that it was so complex that even landlords were not able to understand it. Certainly tenants did not generally have access to the legislation. It is not something the average person keeps in his kitchen.

Landlords generally have to go hire a rent review consultant, and the cost of that is passed on in their rent increases. The tenants have to rely on volunteers, and I think we should commend the people who volunteer their time to chair tenants' associations. I have met many of these people. They are providing a great service to their community in helping to organize the tenants to fight these large rent increases.

I realize Bill 4 is not the answer to all our problems, and it is not meant to be. It is meant to give us a breathing space until we can bring in new legislation which will be fair to tenants and to landlords. I do not believe the current system could be allowed to continue while we are developing that new legislation, because people were hurting too much. I think a two-year moratorium will give us time to develop a decent system if we can get on with it without too much further delay.

I am not sure how my time is here. One comment I would like to make is that the rent crisis we have in Toronto is not uniquely a Toronto problem. I know that and I speak as a person from Metropolitan Toronto, and I know the situation is different in some parts of the province. As the members know, we toured with the standing committee on general government. We went to various places in the province and heard presentations there. The same situation existed in many of those communities. In Metropolitan Toronto, I would be prepared to say with a great deal of certainty that our rent crisis is a major cause of the growth in the use of food banks.

To wrap up, I would like to say that I strongly support Bill 4 and urge all members to do the same.

Mr Mahoney: I wish I did not have to rise to speak about this somewhat draconian legislation—so do my colleagues, actually—but I must put on the record serious concerns. I was very interested in the previous speaker's comments about Metropolitan Toronto because I have said throughout the committee hearings that this is not the province of Toronto. If the government feels there is some requirement to bring in legislation to deal with the Parkdale Tenants' Association or other groups that came before us, then why does the government not simply do that instead of passing legislation that goes right across the province, that affects the smaller communities where the minister and others know full well there is not a serious problem. In fact, we had people coming before us as a committee in Sudbury, we had people coming before us in Hamilton and in London who were saying that this bill is hurting them and forcing them into bankruptcy.

I was particularly interested when the parliamentary assistant spoke. I think I have said before that individual should be the Minister of Housing rather than just the parliamentary assistant. I know her husband agrees with that assessment and thinks that is an excellent idea, but obviously the Premier does not agree with that opinion. I think she would do a much more capable job, frankly, than the current minister who handles two portfolios, Housing and Municipal Affairs.

But I was very interested in her reaction when she used the phrase "nameless and faceless landlords." The reality is they were not nameless and they were not faceless when they sat before us in committee around this province. Once we got outside of the city of Toronto they took on real names and real faces, and they pleaded with the parliamentary assistant and the other members, some of whom are here: "Please don't bankrupt us. Don't pass this legislation." I saw the sympathy.

Mr Mammoliti: Talk about the tenants.

Mr Mahoney: We will talk about the tenants. Everywhere around the province I asked the question, as did other members of that committee: "Other than a cap to the tenants, what does Bill 4 do for you? Does it help you with cockroaches and rodents in your buildings?" The answer was no, it did not do anything to solve that problem. "Does it help you by having the landlords repair problems, holes in the walls, broken appliances? Does it address that problem?" The answer was no, it did not address that problem.

But does the minister care? Obviously not. The minister's reaction was just to ignore it. In fact, over 150 groups were turned away from having an opportunity to come and—

An hon member: Open democracy.

Mr Mahoney: Well, it is a joke. It is a joke from a government—

Hon Mr Pouliot: I am embarrassed.

Mr Mahoney: The Minister of Mines says he is embarrassed. He should be embarrassed representing the government that he represents. It is a disgrace, what this government is doing and the member knows it. That is why he is leaving. I understand that.

They ignore the problems of the damage this bill has done to the economy. As a matter of fact, I remember watching the night of 28 November, when this minister stood up and announced it and announced it was retroactive to 1 October, which in essence meant it went back as long as 18 months, doing a serious amount of damage, causing people to go broke. Announcing it was retroactive to 1 October was the first step of closure. The government brought in closure and did not even hesitate, but it did not need to because the bill is retroactive, therefore the retroactivity means: "We are not going to listen to you, we are not going to care what you say. It is simply retroactive legislation. Go ahead and debate it. You are just wasting your time." To the opposition members: "Go ahead and put amendments. Because we have made it retroactive, we are not going to listen. We have already made up our minds."

It is clear. This government made up its mind in advance. The damage to the economy, the lost jobs in this province—it is absolutely unbelievable for a party and a government which supposedly care about contractors. Some members in the government are actually contractors themselves and supposedly they care about the people they are putting out of work. But do they?

1730

Mr Brown: They don't care.

Mr Mahoney: They do not care. I thank the member for Algoma-Manitoulin very much. They obviously do not care about the people they are putting out of business. I remember watching the news that night, when all the contractors were loading up their vans and their trucks, and they were closing the doors and saying, "That's it, we're out of work." Does that matter to the NDP? No, it does not matter one bit.

Let me just address very briefly the comments about the ultimate plan.

Mr Curling: Take your time.

Mr Mahoney: I do not have enough time.

The ultimate plan is to turn rental accommodation around in this province, is to destroy the value so that the NDP socialists can simply take it over. The landlords think they want to buy them. They are wrong. The NDP does not want to buy them. They want them to go broke so that they can take them over for nothing. That is what they want to do. It is the same policy as the Ministry of Community and Social Services has with regard to private commercial day care: "Let them go broke, then we'll just take them over. We'll make them all non-profit."

Mr Mammoliti: Talk about the tenants.

Mr Mahoney: The member for Yorkview knows that is the hidden agenda. The trouble is, it is not hidden any longer. The jig is up. We know what the government wants to do. We know it wants to bankrupt the small landlords. They are not nameless and faceless, I say to the parliamentary assistant, and she knows it. She heard. She was embarrassed. I saw her embarrassed when those people came before our committee, but she had her marching orders. There was nothing she could do. They were totally muzzled. They were told what to do. They did a good job. There will be a little extra fish in the back for all the seals as soon as this is over.

Hon Mr Cooke: I believe that wraps up the debate from the opposition parties. I first of all want to say that I appreciate the participation of the opposition parties as well as members of my own caucus. Members will remember that this legislation was introduced on 28 November, and very quickly after that the debate on Bill 4 focused on three items which the opposition has focused on as well: the date the bill was to take effect, how capital could be dealt with, and how economic loss could be dealt with. I would like to take a couple of minutes to talk on each of those items.

I have explained before that choosing the date this law would become effective—

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The Minister of Housing started his speech a moment ago by saying, "I guess that wraps up the opposition comments." I simply want to correct the record. We have been forced to wrap up our comments. I had a great deal I wanted to say and simply did not.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. This is not a point of order.

Hon Mr Cooke: As I was saying before my former friend interjected, the effective date to this bill was very much a difficult area of the bill when we were putting it together and making policy decisions. But as I have said before, no matter what date we chose, whether it was 1 October, whether it was 1 November, whether it was 1 December, every single one of those dates presented in itself difficulties and objections by members of either the opposition parties or landlord groups.

I believed then and I believe now that 1 October was an appropriate date for the effectiveness of this bill. It came into effect and will be effective tonight for the day that this party formed the government. I can certainly appreciate some of the concerns that some people have expressed during discussions on this bill, but I believe that no matter what date we had chosen there would have been objections from some folks in the landlord community, and had we chosen other dates there would have been more tenants who were not entirely happy with the date either. Even under the date that we have chosen, over 100,000 apartment units across this province will go through rent review under the old rent review system, the rent review system that was put together by the Liberal Party, which is full of loopholes and does not offer real protection for tenants.

The whole issue of capital, I understand, is an important issue, but I think that some of the arguments that the opposition parties have used in terms of capital expenditures are completely and totally inaccurate. There is \$8 billion spent on rent yearly by tenants in this province. Given the information that our ministry has, approximately 50% of the rent dollar goes to operating costs. That means the balance of the rent dollar is available for things like debt servicing and capital.

To simply let landlords off the hook by saying that the only way capital expenditures will be carried out in this province will be with additional rent increases is, I think, inappropriate and unfair and does not reflect the real situation out there.

I must say that the capital argument that has been used by the critic for the official opposition and by the critic for the third party, that somehow legislation like Bill 4 or whatever permanent legislation we bring in is going to result in Toronto becoming a New York, is completely inappropriate, and I must say that it gets me quite agitated.

I was born in Windsor and I grew up in Windsor. I look across the border to Detroit, where there is no rent control, and I think it is a pretty simplistic and silly argument to say that rent control somehow is the reason that big-city USA has the problems that it has. It is quite a bit more complicated than that, and I think it is inappropriate, but

those are the kinds of arguments that the opposition and some of the landlord communities have used.

On the other issue, that of economic loss, I want to make it very clear that this is one area I think the permanent legislation must be very tough on. We cannot have rent review legislation that rewards investors for buying buildings when the rent will not even supply the financing cost of those buildings. That is simply the wrong message for rent control legislation to send to landlords and investors across this province. It encourages flips; it encourages the purchase of buildings when the rents will not support the borrowing for those buildings. It sends the wrong message, and that is what Bill 51 did. It sends the message that you can buy an apartment building for whatever you want to pay for it, whether the rents will support that building or not, and then you can go to the rent review system and raise the rents to support that price, whether the price was valid or not. That is not the kind of permanent rent control legislation or temporary legislation that our party wants to encourage.

I guess the basic approach that we have taken as a government and as a party, which is different than that of the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party, the basic underpinning of our philosophy is that decent, healthy housing is a basic human right. That is the philosophy that our government has enunciated. No other party, no other government in the past has been willing to put that principle in writing. Our government has put that principle in writing because we believe in it and we are going to do our best to deliver on that philosophy.

There were a few areas in Bill 4 that allowed for some flexibility. That flexibility dealt with property taxes, the renewal of a mortgage, and utilities—those types of flexibilities in the operating costs. I certainly want to, through the discussion paper and the green paper, look at those kinds of flexibilities that need to be in any type of guideline for rent increase purposes.

Rather than dwell on the particulars of Bill 4, because we have had several months to do that, I would like to talk a little bit about the committee process and perhaps about the contribution that the opposition parties have made to this debate.

First of all, I would very much like to thank the critic for the Liberal Party, the member for Eglinton, and the critic for the Conservative Party, the member for Dufferin-Peel, both of whom, I think, have played out their roles appropriately in the opposition parties. I would also like to thank my parliamentary assistant, the member for Niagara Falls, and the member for Wentworth North, who were both on the committee, as well as the other committee members. But these two members played a particularly important role during the debate on Bill 4.

1740

I guess I should also mention that the interest groups in the province, whether it was Fair Rental Policy Organization of Ontario or the Association for Furthering Ontario's Rental Development or the various tenants' organizations, have all played a very lively role in this debate, some of which I appreciate, some of which I think might have gone over the edge of good taste, but none the less is all part of

the process in a democratic society. I encourage them to participate in the next step of our consultation in developing permanent legislation.

On this legislation the Conservative Party has taken a principle point of view. Their point of view is clear. They believe—and they fundamentally disagree with our point of view—that rent control and regulation of rents is wrong and that the rental market should be deregulated. That is their point of view and I happen to fundamentally disagree with it. The government fundamentally disagrees with it. They have come to that point in their history as a political party, after supporting rent control in the mid-1970s and after supporting Bill 51, the Liberal rent control legislation, in the mid-1980s, and every piece of rent control legislation up to this one, they have supported. But now in 1991, they have decided to go back to their roots and support deregulation and let tenants fend for themselves.

This is a principle point of view, and we have a fundamental difference of opinion, but I respect the point of view that the Conservative Party has taken. I think there are some basic flaws in the position that the Conservative Party has taken. They argue that if you deregulate somehow the private market will take care of all of the difficulties. It will mean that the private sector will build and that competition will take place in the market, and that will keep rents low. That is not the experience elsewhere, it is not the experience in British Columbia, and it differs from the reality of the situation here in Ontario.

The reality is that it is not rent control that causes low vacancies. It is low vacancies that cause rent control. That has been the history in Ontario, that has been our experience, and that has been the experience in other jurisdictions as well. Currently 33% of the tenants in this province pay more than 30% of their monthly income on rent. That means that some tenants in this province are paying 40%, 50% and 60% of their monthly income on rent. That means some seniors in this province are having to pay 50% and 60% of their monthly income on rent and that food is not adequate for those seniors. That has an effect on our health care system, and there is a whole bunch of consequences from a system that does not adequately protect tenants.

The Tory solution is to eliminate rent control and bring in rent subsidies. The result of that is clear. Deregulation could result in rents going up, and we would have to also bring in these rent subsidies which would cost the taxpayers of this province hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, it is not unrealistic to say that the concept that the Conservatives have put forward could cost the taxpayers of this province billions of dollars over the years.

I do not believe, and this government does not believe, that we should take billions of dollars of taxpayers' money and subsidize the private sector. That is not the approach that this party is going to take.

However, I congratulate the Conservative Party for having a principle position, a position that I fundamentally disagree with and no doubt a position that we will be able to debate in the future as well.

Mrs Cunningham: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: We came up to this House this afternoon to hear the government talk about its position, not the position of our party in opposition, and I would appreciate it if the minister stayed on topic.

The Speaker: No doubt a point of irritation for the member; not a point of order. Perhaps the minister would find it acceptable to address his remarks to the Chair.

Hon Mr Cooke: Well, Mr Speaker, I have been trying to do that but I will shift gears now. I would like to spend a couple of minutes talking about the very valuable if confusing contribution that the Liberal Party has made to this discussion.

On 28 November, when this legislation was introduced, the critic for the Liberal Party got up and said: "On the one hand, we criticize the New Democratic Party government because it's not doing exactly what was in the program for people. On the other hand, we say that you have gone too far and that you're going to turn our apartment dwellings into slums."

I have said before that you could take those responses on 28 November and cut them in half and you could send one half of them to the tenants of this province and the other half of them to the landlords of the province, and that is the kind of position the Liberal Party has taken on this issue.

Then we had our debate on second reading. We had an extensive discussion on second reading, and what happened on second reading? The Liberal Party said, "In principle, we support this bill." They read the principle as being support for tenants. Well, they are quite correct. One of the major principles of this bill is proper support for tenants in this province, but obviously fundamental to this bill is the moratorium on rents.

Mrs Caplan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like to ask you to remind the minister that in fact we are hearing the wrapup of a debate on a piece of legislation which has been proposed by the government. What we have heard from the minister, with all due respect, is a speech from the official opposition, or what we would have heard from him when he was on this side of the House. He has used all of his time to give an opposition speech. He has two minutes left to speak about the merits of his legislation and I ask that you ask him to do this.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Whoa. Can we stop the clock for a minute, please? I realize that this topic engenders a great deal of enthusiasm, interest, even irritation, but it would certainly be helpful if all members would just relax, listen to the windup and then we can get on with, I understand, a vote.

Hon Mr Cooke: As I was saying, on second reading the Liberal Party voted in favour of this legislation. They said that the principle of this legislation was protection for tenants. I agree and this party agrees that the principle of this legislation is protection for tenants. We promised before the election, we promised during the election, and we have delivered after the election on real rent control and real protection for tenants. But the question this afternoon

is not where this government stands on the principle of protection for tenants. The question this afternoon is not where the Conservative Party stands on protection for tenants. They have outlined their position very clearly. They voted against the bill on second reading. They have been consistent in their opposition. The question this afternoon is: Where are the principles of the Liberal Party of Ontario? That is the question that will be answered this afternoon.

It is absolutely clear to me that in about the next 10 or 15 minutes there will be a vote in the Legislature, and those who supported the bill on second reading when we voted in principle will be called upon again to decide where they stand and whether they still have those principles, and in a very few minutes we will have the opportunity to see whether the Liberal Party of Ontario is consistent in its principles of better support for tenants in this province or whether they are all over the map. I know that when I was elected in 1977 one of the principles of the Liberal Party was that it was all over the map. In about five minutes there will again be the opportunity. The Liberals can stand for their principles or they can play politics, and I, for one, will be looking to see whether the Liberals will stand for their principles.

The Speaker: Mr Cooke moves third reading of Bill 4. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

Interjections.

The Speaker: To the member for York Centre, I will be conducting the vote when I have the attention of the members. Those in favour—

Interjections.

The Speaker: We are all relaxed and we are enjoying the afternoon.

An hon member: No, we are not.

The Speaker: No? Okay.

1756

The House divided on Mr Cooke's motion for third reading of Bill 4, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes—62

Abel, Akande, Bisson, Boyd, Carter, Charlton, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays—36

Amott, Beer, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Cleary, Cunningham, Elston, Eves, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jackson, Jordan, Mahoney, Marland, McClelland, McLean, McLeod, Miclash, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ramsay, Runciman, Sorbara, Stockwell, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Witmer.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor awaits to give royal assent to a bill in this chamber.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon Mr Alexander: Pray be seated.

The Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has, at its present meetings thereof, passed a certain bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: The following is the title of the bill to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Residential Rent Regulation Act, 1986.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to this bill.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

The House adjourned at 1806.

ERRATUM

o.	Page	Column	Line	Should read:
9	813	1	27	NATIONAL CONSUMER WEEK

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services
			minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Ampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
ansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
arnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
arrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
arris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
aslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
ayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
enderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
ope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
uget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
ackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
mison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
hanson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
rdan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
lopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
ormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
winter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
ankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
ughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
essard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
ahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
alkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
ammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
ancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
archese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
arland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
artel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
artin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
athysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
McClash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
McLills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
McMorin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
McMorrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
McMurdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
McMurdoch, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
McNixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
McNort, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Memba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Winter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Randmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Willeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Peter Kormos, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 22 April 1991

Members' statements		
James Hammond Sr851	
Mr Offer		
St Gregory Separate School851	
Mr Stockwell		
Waterfront trail851	
Mr White		
Erindale campus, University of Toronto852	
Mr Mahoney		
Eastern Ontario852	
Mr Jordan		
Earth Day852	
Mr Hayes		
Donation of medication852	
Mr Henderson		
Children's services852	
Mr Jackson		
Hamilton Regional Conservation Authority853	
Mr Abel		
Statements by the ministry		
Assistance to Kurds855	
Ms Ziemba		
Angeline Del Col855	
Ms Akande		
Responses		
Assistance to Kurds856	
Mr Offer		
Angeline Del Col856	
Mr Beer		
Assistance to Kurds856	
Mr Cousens		
Angeline Del Col857	
Mr Jackson		
Oral questions		
Social assistance858	
Mr Nixon		
Mr Rae		
Tax revenues859	
Mr Nixon		
Ms Wark-Martyn		
Court system859	
Mr Harris		
Mr Hampton		
Garbage disposal860	
Mr Cousens		
Mrs Grier		
Mrs Marland		
Termination agreement861	
Mr Elston		
Mr Rae		
Automobile insurance862	
Mr Harnick		
Mr Rae		
Education policy863	
Ms Haeck		
Mrs Boyd		
Mining industry863	
Mr Bradley		
Mr Laughren		
Trucking industry864	
Mr Arnott		
Mr Philip		
Proceeds of crime864	
Mr Morrow		
Mr Farnan		
Mandatory retirement864	
Mr Mahoney		
Ms Ziemba		
Assistance to farmers865	
Mr Villeneuve		
Mr Buchanan		
Child care865	
Mrs McLeod		
Ms Akande		
Motion		
Private members' public business866	
Miss Martel		
Agreed to866	
Petitions		
Police services866	
Mrs Mathysen		
Unemployment866	
Mr Brown		
St Gregory Separate School866	
Mr Stockwell		
Nursing homes867	
Mr Brown		
Committee of the whole House		
Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991,		
Bill 4867	
Miss Martel		
Progress reported867	

Third reading

Residential Rent Regulation Amendment Act, 1991,	
Bill 4867
Miss Martel867
Ms Poole867
Mr Turnbull870
Ms Harrington871
Mrs Caplan872
Mr Carr874
Mr Drainville875
Mrs Y. O'Neill876
Mr Tilson877
Ms M. Ward880
Mr Mahoney880
Agreed to884

Royal assent

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor884
--	------

Other business

Legislative pages851
The Speaker	
Visitor853
Mr Malkowski	
Earth Day853
Mrs Grier	
Mr Ramsay	
Mr Cousens	
Cabinet members857
Mr Nixon	
Adjournment884
Erratum885

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities886
Committees of the Legislative Assembly889



Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 23 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 23 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 23 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ONTARIO BORDER COMMUNITIES

Mr Cleary: Last week I informed the House that the congestion on the Seaway International Bridge at Cornwall had gotten to the point that cars are often held up for two hours. Canada Customs figures show that this past Easter weekend more than 14,200 cars crossed the Seaway bridge—two and a half times as many as made the crossing at the same time last year.

There is a loss of faith in this government. While losing millions annually in revenue and taxes, this government has failed to take a proactive stance on the cross-border issue and its causes.

I would remind the House that the Treasurer of Ontario told the Toronto Sun on 30 March that he was considering a three-cent reduction in gas taxes in northern Ontario. The Treasurer is surely aware that the economic picture in eastern Ontario is not much rosier.

Just a few days after the article appeared in the Sun, the Treasurer cautioned that Ontario border communities should not get their hopes up for tax breaks. I do not contend that tax breaks for all border communities should solve the problem once and for all, but they would go a long way to assist areas like the one I have the opportunity to represent in dealing with the recession. The Ontario Border Communities Mayors' Task Force on Cross-Border and Sunday Shopping has secured a commitment from the federal and provincial governments to discuss cross-border communities' unique problems. A graduated gas tax system may be one of the answers.

I would like to remind the Treasurer that he should not forget about eastern Ontario when drafting his budget next Monday.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Mr Cousens: There is an old saying that says, "They who hesitate are lost." I feel that those who are involved with the crisis of Metro's waste cannot but feel a little lost with the Minister of the Environment's waste management plans.

Yesterday, Metro's works committee was struggling with waste management, trying to discern what role the Minister of the Environment wants it to play. There has been much confusion as to just what the minister's strategy is.

Is the province going to assume control and operation of Metro-area landfill sites? Would this mean that the province would pocket the tipping fees for this garbage? How are the municipal recycling programs supposed to be paid for, if this is the case? Metro currently uses the tipping fees it collects to subsidize Toronto's blue box program. There is a real fear that this excellent program may

have to be paid for out of property taxes, given the changes the minister is making.

What are her ministry's intentions? Is she trying to create confusion? Some are so frustrated that they have suggested that her ministry should take over waste management completely and end the confusion that way.

The minister must show some leadership. She must do something to end the confusion and contradiction in her policy on waste management in Metro and elsewhere. It is Earth Week—now is the time to act. Would she please do something about it, rather than just create more and more confusion?

BACKUS CONSERVATION EDUCATION CENTRE

Mr Jamison: This past Saturday, it was my pleasure to attend the opening of the new, \$1.3-million Backus Conservation Education Centre in Long Point. This project was the result of a joint effort by federal, provincial and local authorities.

The new centre will not only serve to inform visitors about the rich and diverse natural environment of the Backus woods and Long Point area but will also provide a location for education programs about conservation for all kinds of groups, from local schools to nature societies.

This week in particular we should recognize what a special achievement this is. This is Earth Week and this is a special time for all to reflect on how precious our environment is and how little we really appreciate and understand this precious resource. That is why projects such as this are so important, as they combine concerns for the natural environment with the concern for the education of the community.

Not only this, but this centre also stands to remind us what can be achieved when all levels of government come together in a joint effort in the interests of serving the community. I would like to express my special appreciation to those involved in making this happen and I would thank them all individually.

1340

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Mr Mancini: Today is Public Transit Day. In order to meet the needs of tomorrow, our public transit systems must continue to grow. Our linkages and gateways between new and existing services must be planned now and adequately funded to sustain economic development.

The structures we design today for our local, regional and interregional transit services of tomorrow will have a dominant impact on what our communities will be like in the future.

While in opposition, the NDP talked a lot about the need for more transit, and we are pleased that the NDP has decided to at least reannounce previous Liberal funding for transit planned under the \$2-billion transportation capital plan and the \$5-billion Let's Move program. These Liberal programs covered the development of over 140 kilometres

of new rail transit in the GTA, more than doubling the existing rail transit. But the NDP has not yet announced its strategy for expanding GO train service as was promised during the campaign. The NDP has reneged on its promise to extend GO train service to Peterborough. The NDP has cancelled plans announced by the Liberal government to extend GO train service to Kitchener-Waterloo and also to Orillia.

Interjection.

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, I cannot continue because the honourable member has constantly barracked through my entire statement, and I ask you to see if you can add a few seconds to my time.

The Speaker: It would certainly be helpful if all members could listen attentively while others are making what they are entitled to make, members' statements.

Mr Mancini: A barrage like that is unnecessary.

The Speaker: Would the honourable member just take his seat for a moment. You were at your conclusion, I believe, at the point where there was some difficulty. Would you continue with the last paragraph of your statement.

Mr Mancini: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The NDP has broken its promise to increase the province's share of Toronto Transit Commission funding above 16%. This is especially critical at this time, as spiralling welfare costs have restricted Metro's ability to pay for the TTC, and at a time when the TTC is forced to cut back service. We need the NDP to keep its promise on the transit issues of the day.

TAXATION

Mr Stockwell: Late last week my party launched a campaign to warn the Ontario Treasurer about raising taxes, running up the deficit and increasing spending in his upcoming provincial budget. We are distributing thousands of brochures asking Ontarians to fax or mail a form urging the Treasurer to say no to any further tax or spending increases in the 1991 provincial budget.

Since the Treasurer announced that his budget would be tabled on 29 April, I thought he would be most interested in knowing how the Fax Floyd campaign is progressing.

This morning, members of the Conservative caucus handed out hundreds of brochures, including the Fax Floyd form, at various transit stations throughout Metro. To date we have received almost 500 responses from all across Ontario telling the Treasurer they are ticked off with sky-high taxes, big-spending government, massive debt and wasted tax dollars.

We know that the previous government, which introduced some 32 new and increased taxes throughout its five-year term, never listened to the people of Ontario. I can only hope that this government, the so-called open and accessible government, will listen to the people and that the Treasurer will keep his hands out of the pockets of the Ontario taxpayers.

The NDP may have given us An Agenda for People, but with our Fax Floyd campaign, this party is giving the people of Ontario what they really need—this party is giving the people of Ontario An Agenda for Taxpayers.

BELLE RIVER CONSTITUENCY OFFICE FIRE

Mr Hayes: Last weekend I witnessed an overwhelming display of community outreach and support.

As many members may have already heard, my Belle River constituency office was destroyed in a fire last Friday. Not only was the building gutted and the furniture unsalvageable, but the files and paperwork—seven months of sweat and hard research by my staff—were sopping wet and blackened. This is when an amazing thing happened. The community of Belle River pulled together.

Acting on advice from Archives of Ontario, which gave specific instructions on how to save fire-ravaged documents, about 20 people gathered on Saturday to remove the papers and dry them in a painstaking and delicate process to save as much work as possible.

Phil Charrette, the principal and custodian of staff of Belle River High School, opened up the facilities for volunteers; the Salvation Army staff served food and refreshments; and the Becker's staff across from the constituency office lent support and put up with the large crowd at the scene of the fire. The Belle River community information centre greeted us with open arms, and we are using that centre now as a temporary location.

I also want to make a special note of the efforts of the five fire departments in attendance, the Belle River, Rochester, Maidstone, Tecumseh and Windsor detachments.

Last, a very special thanks to the staff from Steven Langdon's office who helped us. Right now, we are in the midst of looking for a temporary location which we will have, hopefully, within six weeks.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr Sola: Peel regional council approved the following resolution at its meeting held on 28 March 1991:

"Whereas the waste disposal issue is building to an even greater crisis month by month, since the Minister of the Environment arbitrarily removed our responsibility for developing a new landfill site; and

"Whereas we are still very much in the dark as to the minister's plans to deal with this issue; and

"Whereas the minister's action on this issue is in our opinion, extremely detrimental to the citizens of Peel as it relates to the cost of garbage disposal; and

"Whereas we are gravely concerned about the dictatorial attitude of the Ministry of the Environment which is evident by the order made under the Planning Act, 1983 dated 27 March 1991 which is the result of the minister discovering the impact of her decision to take over responsibility for waste disposal of the greater Toronto area;

"Therefore be it resolved that the regional chairman arrange an emergency meeting with the Premier of Ontario, the Minister of the Environment and the heads of the local governments in the regions of Peel, York and Durham to enable us to obtain answers on this very grave crisis situation;

"If the minister is consulting affected regions, as claimed, then how come the region of Peel feels the decision she reached is 'arbitrary'?

"If she has consulted, then how come they feel 'very much in the dark'?

"If she has met with affected groups, then how come they consider her attitude 'dictatorial'?"

"If they have been informed, then how come they have not requested an 'emergency meeting' to obtain answers on his 'very grave crisis situation'?"

TRANSPORTATION FOR THE DISABLED

Mrs Marland: Today is Public Transit Day. As part of Earth Week, we are encouraged to leave our cars at home and use public transit. While it is a day to focus on converting drivers to transit users, we must not forget those persons who already rely on public transit. In particular, I am concerned about disabled persons.

Most persons with disabilities would like the choice of using conventional transit. However, they are denied this choice because trains, buses and stations are inaccessible to them.

Last week, I raised the lack of safety for blind users of Toronto's subway system and the slowness of installing edge markers to make our subways safer for blind persons.

There are several other issues which must also be addressed: The easier access program will require changes to the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act which have yet to be introduced. In our urban centres, disabled persons rely upon parallel transit systems which are often overbooked. Rides must be scheduled in advance, and even then cannot be guaranteed. Accessible taxi services would help solve this problem, but so far only 28 communities in this entire province operate only 52 accessible taxis. Disabled persons need accessible public transit to lead full and rewarding lives. I hope this government will take action to resolve the issues I have raised today.

In closing, I hope that today being Public Transit Day, the Minister of Transportation will be in attendance, as he is not presently.

ASSISTANCE TO ROMANIAN ORPHANS

Mr Fletcher: Most of us have heard of the plight of Romanian orphans. Children die from congenital heart disease, diabetes, severe malnutrition, respiratory problems and pneumonia. There is a scant supply of drugs and diagnostic equipment. Children even die of high fever because there is no aspirin. At the hospital in Resita, the paediatric intensive care ward has a weigh scale, an obsolete sterilizer and a makeshift oxygen tank—it is merely a holding tank to die. At an orphanage in the same city, staff of four care for 140 children up to the age of three.

I would like to draw attention to a humanitarian relief effort undertaken by my community of Guelph. Since last May, a family doctor, Dr Derrick Paquette, and a Guelph lawyer, Lorna Lee Snowie, have spearheaded a drive to make medical equipment and supplies to Romania.

Their efforts have gained support from the Lions, Rotary, Kiwanis and Optimist clubs of Guelph, from the Guelph General Hospital and from St Joseph's Hospital. In fact, the Sisters of St Joseph's, who run the five southwestern hospitals, have devoted their energies to help with this local relief effort.

Some pharmaceutical companies have donated antibiotics, hepatitis vaccine, analgesics and skin ointments.

McNeil Consumer Products of Guelph, formerly Johnson and Johnson, is shipping a 40-foot container of vitamins this weekend, and Searle Pharmaceutical has paid for air fare and has undertaken fund-raising.

In January, I drew the Romanian relief effort to the attention of the member for Beaches-Woodbine, then Minister of Government Services, in the hopes that this government might be able to assist. I have received word from the minister that she has instructed the external asset program to look into what might be of help in this humanitarian effort.

1350

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before proceeding, members may wish to welcome a visitor to the west gallery, a Canadian member of Parliament, Harry Brightwell, from Perth-Wellington-Waterloo, Ontario, and his wife, Dorell.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Hon Mr Farnan: Yesterday as I left the House, I was presented by members of the media with a copy of a letter, written on constituency office stationery, that indicated a member of my constituency office staff had communicated with a justice of the peace on behalf of one of my Cambridge constituents. Although my name appeared on the letter, and was initialed by a constituency staff member, I had never seen the letter before; neither had I personally signed it.

I looked into this matter immediately and I have learned that the letter was written by one of my constituency staff who was on probation and who sought direction from a more experienced staff member.

I was also informed that a second letter was written, in March of this year, to another justice of the peace by another member of my constituency staff. This letter had my name attached in a similar fashion and was initialed by that staff member. In this case also I had never seen the letter before, nor had I personally signed it.

In both of these cases, I recognize the serious inappropriateness of the action taken. I have turned over to the Attorney General's office the facts and documents relating to both cases and all of my staff have been directed to make available all correspondence to any investigation that takes place.

I believe that the Solicitor General must be at arm's length from the judiciary. As a member of the provincial Parliament, and more recently as the Solicitor General of Ontario, I have been guided in my actions by this principle. I have never in the past, including either of these occasions, made any direct or indirect contact with a member of the judiciary.

PROPERTY ASSESSMENT

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: Today I delivered a letter which I wrote to Alan Tonks, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, to advise him that the government has completed its review of Metro council's market value reassessment plan.

Routinely, ministry staff will continue to update their records by conducting the required interior and exterior property inspections in order to ensure that our records are as accurate as possible. This information will enable us to prepare market value estimates for all property in Metro. The assessment impact study will be based on updated records.

The Ministry of Revenue will continue to take all the necessary steps to prepare an assessment impact study for Metro council's consideration in 1992, as requested in Metro council's resolutions of September 1989 and March 1990. In the interim, the staff of the Ministry of Revenue will support the Ministry of Housing in its work with Metro staff to ensure the pass-through of tax decreases to tenants of multiresidential properties.

Provision of the impact study will enable Metro council to make its final decision whether or not to request the province to pass the appropriate legislation. We will await this final decision before proceeding to the next step of the process.

In conclusion, I want to ensure the House that the government, in taking this decision, clearly recognizes that the overall fairness of the property tax system is an issue that must continue to be addressed.

ONTARIO STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Hon Mr Allen: I wish to announce today that important adjustments are going to be made to student assistance programs. These improvements will reflect increases in students' costs and correct inequities that have been felt for some time by certain student groups.

The eight changes will go into effect immediately and will apply to the coming academic year.

First, OSAP will be adjusted to accommodate tuition fee increases and students will receive a 5% increase in allowable costs to offset escalating living costs.

Second, grant maximums for disabled students will be increased, to \$3,550, to help them cover disability-related expenses that they cannot meet under current grant maximums. Generally, present maximums vary from \$1,550 to \$2,550, depending on the student's circumstances.

Third, married students with children will benefit from an improved child care allowance. The new allowance for each child will be raised to \$700 per term from the present \$100 per term.

Fourth, contributions expected from the spouses of married students will be decreased to the same level as those expected from the parents of dependent students. For example, in 1990-91 a couple earning \$28,000 was expected to contribute \$3,900. In 1991-92, under these changes, the same couple will be expected to contribute about \$1,100.

Fifth, OSAP residency requirements for students who are permanent residents will be the same as those for Canadian citizens. Previously, in certain situations permanent residents faced more stringent criteria than did Canadian citizens. They were often, if not usually, families and students from other provinces.

Sixth, part-time students will receive larger transportation and personal living allowances. In previous years,

part-time students got a percentage of the full-time allowance, based on what percentage of a full course load they were taking. Now they will receive the same amount as full-time students.

A seventh adjustment, changes to the way Ontario utilizes the Canada student loan program, will make an extra \$36 million in loans available to Ontario students. Because we will now be allowing additional expenses, single students will receive a \$28-per-week miscellaneous allowance and married and sole-support parents will be eligible for an additional maintenance allowance of \$634 per child if they have one or two children and \$1,248 if they have three or four children.

I would also like to announce that the number of Ontario graduate scholarships will be increased by 100, from 1,200 to 1,300. This is the first time the number of scholarships has been increased since the program's inception. The amount of the scholarships will also be increased, to \$3,953 from \$3,766 per term.

Students will be more fairly treated as a result of these adjustments, and that is why I am pleased to be able to make these changes immediately. Nevertheless, we recognize that there is need for a major overhaul of the Ontario student assistance program in more basic ways than can be accomplished in a few months' time. Therefore, I want also to announce today that my ministry is undertaking a major review of the Ontario student assistance program.

Some of the issues that the review will look at include: financial eligibility criteria; the way student aid is allocated, including an examination of student debt loads; and measures to help non-traditional students, including part-time students, those with special needs, single parents and adult learners.

1400

This review will be done in consultation with students, faculty, administrators and others who have an interest in the Ontario student aid program. I expect the review to be completed by August of this year and I intend to implement fundamental changes in the system by the time university and college students go back to school in the fall of 1992. I want to assure members that this review will be thorough and that I am determined to do whatever has to be done to make access to higher education fair and equitable for all Ontarians.

ALGOMA STEEL CORP

Hon Mr Pilkey: On 7 March—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Would you stop the clock, please?

Interjections.

The Speaker: You are relaxed now and you are all ready to listen to the minister's announcement. All right.

Hon Mr Pilkey: On 7 March 1991 the Premier announced the establishment of a task force on the Algoma Steel Corp, chaired by Tim Armstrong, Deputy Minister, Industry, Trade and Technology, with members from the community, the company, the salaried employees, the steelworkers' union, Algoma's creditors and the federal and provincial governments. The task force has been

working to assist the development of a comprehensive and viable solution to Algoma's business situation by examining alternatives and dealing with issues that must be resolved to restore the company to financial health. Today I would like to take a few moments to advise the honourable members of the progress made to date.

The first meeting of the task force was held on Tuesday 2 March in Sault Ste Marie. Two subcommittees were established: one to review the business plan options and another to monitor the company's short-term financial results.

At the second meeting, which was held on 17 April in Toronto, the company and each of the major stakeholders represented on the task force presented progress reports, indicating the main areas of activity where the work is proceeding and identifying the internal and external experts involved.

A third committee was created to explore ways of creating a vehicle for some degree of employee ownership in the company. Both Algoma and representatives of employees on the task force have indicated that they are open to discussions on this topic.

In addition to the formal meetings of the task force and its subcommittees and the analytical work being carried out by the company and other stakeholders, there have been frequent and generally productive meetings and contacts between Algoma and the various members of the task force.

I am pleased to report that the task force has assembled a rather impressive group of experts in all the necessary disciplines to work towards a successful resolution of Algoma's current situation. The steelworkers have set up advisory committees within each local union to provide for two-way communication about Algoma's future plans to unionized employees. The salaried employees at Algoma have also set up a steering committee to provide advice and ideas to the task force and the company. The government of Ontario, acting through the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology, has engaged Price Waterhouse of Toronto to review the company's short-term operating results, Burns Fry of Toronto to advise on the financial aspects of the restructuring and Beddows and Co of London, England and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to review structural and marketing prospects in the North American steel industry.

Over the next two weeks, the task force subcommittees and individual task force members will continue to meet and exchange information as required. The next meeting of the full task force is scheduled for May 3, at which time the company's initial restructuring proposal will be presented. The chair of the task force reports to me that all the interested parties are co-operating fully in the goals of the task force and that good progress is in fact being made. While much remains to be done, it is clear that all parties are dedicating their time, resources and expertise to arrive at an acceptable solution to Algoma's programs, with a view to ensuring its survival as a viable enterprise and at maximum employment levels.

Mr Scott: We want a government that's as good as its word. You said you'd be better; you've been worse.

Hon Mr Pilkey: I shall keep the honourable members advised as the matter proceeds, and perhaps it may even get to be of interest, in terms of retaining business and employment to employees, to the member for St George-St David.

RESPONSES

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: The letter referred to by the Solicitor General in his statement reads in part as follows:

"3 April 1991. Mr Ramnarine, Justice of the Peace, Provincial Court House, Toronto.

"Re: Mr Richard Warne...my constituent. Mr Warne is very upset and alarmed at the fact that he will have to take time off work and also incur costs for a trip to Toronto for an offence that he did not commit"—"That he did not commit" is underlined—"Could you please review his file and advise me before the court date.... Yours sincerely, Mike Farnan"—in writing—"pp BL" and printed, "Mike Farnan, MPP. Copy Honourable Ed Philip."

The honourable minister would know for sure that if he was responsible for that letter, it would be cause for his immediate resignation or dismissal. There is no question about that. His defence is that he knew nothing about it; it was done by someone else for whom he had no responsibility.

The Premier's guidelines, 12 December 1990, in section 19, "Ministers...shall not communicate with members of the judiciary concerning any matter pending before the court."

Further, section 24: "Where a minister's constituency office undertakes activities in which members normally engage on behalf of constituents, ministers shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that their office as minister is not used to further the interests of the constituent." That is rule 24.

So it boils down to this. Assuming that the minister, who has been elected twice to this House—and although the Premier indicated he is a neophyte, he is an experienced member of the opposition and the government—must surely have been unaware of these directives, for him to say he has no responsibility for his office or for the people who work in his constituency office is strange indeed.

I only note in passing that the members of many of the ministers' offices were personally selected by the Premier's chief advisers in the Premier's office. Whether or not that was the case in this instance is not known.

But I do not feel that there is any question in the House or the community that no member, certainly not a cabinet minister, should interfere in any way with the judicial process and certainly should not be seen to be so interfering.

1410

It is difficult to respond to the minister's mea culpa, It was done, but it was not his responsibility.

I simply bring to the minister's attention something that I recall very well, and this was put forward in a report of the standing committee on public accounts to the Second Session of the 33rd Parliament, tabled Friday 1 October 1986, entitled Second Report on the Allegation of

Conflict of Interest Concerning Elinor Caplan, MPP. On page 3 of that report under item 2 it says as follows:

"Her assertion of ignorance of her husband's activities is not a defence. It was her responsibility and obligation as a minister of the crown to know. Elinor Caplan was therefore in breach of the Premier's own guidelines governing conflict of interest."

The Premier was quoted as saying to the press this morning words to the effect, "Come on, let's be fair." I know the Solicitor General is an honourable man, and that is not in question. He is a colleague of all of us here and we regret the situation that his administrative incompetence has put him in. But the Premier says, "Let's be fair." As a result of this report from the committee in 1986, my seatmate remained out of the cabinet until she was re-elected in an election and came back into ministerial responsibility.

I do not want to say to the Premier, "Let's be fair." I say, "Let's be responsible." He has guidelines which are well known. They must be enforced. It is not a question of the minister's judgement, but the judgement of the head of the government.

The Speaker: The member for Ottawa-Rideau.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I want to respond to the statement of the Minister of Revenue. The statement—

The Speaker: I understand how you feel. The leader of the third party.

Mr Harris: Perhaps the running out of time in response to statements points out that I think there were some discussions earlier about whether the Solicitor General's statement should have been made outside of normal ministerial statements. I do not think it was a statement about government policy and I think it is something that all would have wanted to respond to.

Interjections.

Mr Harris: I am also very cognizant of the fact that the NDP caucus this morning was told to be noisy, loud, applaud everything, put on a good façade to cover up the shame and the shambles that our cabinet is bringing down on our government, and I appreciate the marching orders they got. They are doing a good job.

Because I will be bringing this matter up in question period today—there are a number of unanswered questions that we are going to have to get to the bottom of—I will provide a little bit of time for my members to respond to the other statements. However, I want to say this in response to the statement by the Solicitor General. There is not one word in the statement today that admits or acknowledges that the Premier's guidelines have been violated—not one word.

Clearly, the Premier's guidelines have been violated. Outside the House and again today we have heard, "We're going to blame this junior staffer." However, there is no admission that the guidelines have been violated. There is no sense that there has been any investigation carried out by the Premier about who else knew about this; who else in cabinet may have known about this; who authorized a staff member to sign a letter—any letter. Who made that

authorization? Who was responsible for that that prompted these guidelines to be violated?

Clearly there has been a violation of the Premier's guidelines, and unless the Premier, who must accept responsibility for these, is prepared to stand up and admit that, I find it very difficult to get to the bottom of this to find out who it is who should resign, because it is starting to get closer and closer and closer to the Premier's office itself.

ONTARIO STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mrs Cunningham: I would like to respond to the statement by the Minister of Colleges and Universities. With regard to the statement today, there are certainly some long-overdue changes the minister has responded to on behalf of students in the province of Ontario. I would like at this time to tell him about a few others that are just as important.

It is fine to talk about accessibility, and we are certainly not unhappy with what the minister has done for the disabled students, for the graduate students and for the increase in the number of scholarships. But at the same time, we would plead with him to take a look at the renewal both of faculty and our university system in Ontario.

I have before me the Ontario Universities' Recovery Plan Summary. While the minister was speaking, we had some seven phone calls with regard to the tremendous need for a serious look at the underfunding, the overcrowding of our classrooms, the obsolete equipment and the fact that our university system just is not competitive. For a student, we fund ninth out of 10 provinces in Canada. It just is not good enough.

There is a very responsible plan that asks for participation by students as well. We are hoping we will see that as part of the budget discussions.

With regard to the statement, I would say we are happy about the review that is to be completed by August. We think that may be a short period of time. We would hope that the minister would think about it very seriously, very carefully, and if we are not looking to the fall of 1992 for implementation perhaps more serious consideration could be made next September and October, when the students return, for serious input.

PROPERTY ASSESSMENT

Mr Stockwell: I would like to respond to the statement by the Minister of Revenue on market value assessment.

The minister is tap dancing around the issue. The issue is whether her government is in favour of market value assessment. She has continued to tap dance and she is probably going to continue to tap dance. Her government was very clear before the election that it was not in favour. Today she is telling us they are doing studies to update the market value assessment rolls. Two days ago she was telling us they were not doing studies to update the market value rolls. It is not doing a revision there it is doing a revision. She refuses to take a position. The question today is, what is the minister doing and when is she going to implement it?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: The Premier is well aware of the situation involving the Solicitor General. He, along with every member of this House and everyone who knows anything about our parliamentary procedure, knows that members must not transgress into the responsibility of the judiciary. There have been many examples where members and cabinet ministers have done this and have immediately resigned or been dismissed.

Would the Premier agree that the evidence of the letter he has seen—while it is signed “Mike Farnan” we are told it was signed by a functionary in his office—would be evidence of such transgression and therefore would fall into the category I have described?

Hon Mr Rae: I do not accept one single premise the Leader of the Opposition is putting forward, not one single one.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: I have the word of the Solicitor General. We have the statement made by the individual in question that he never met the Solicitor General. I have the word of the Solicitor General that this is in no way, shape or form his letter. The comparisons the member is making are quite unfair and totally invalid with respect to this situation. The Solicitor General did not write a letter, he did not authorize a letter, he did not approve a letter and he did not send a letter. The notion that he should have to resign because of that is absurd.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Will you stop the clock, please?

Interjections.

The Speaker: I have stopped the clock. I have stopped the clock for a reason. I am extremely aware, and very sensitive to the fact, that this is a highly charged issue. I think it would give all of us as well as the viewers at home some pleasure if we could discuss this in a calm and rational way. I appreciate the feelings are high on both sides of the chamber, but I also tell you that if we are to continue with question period today, we cannot continue the way we have in the last 30 seconds.

1420

Mr Nixon: The Premier's righteous indignation does not fit into the requirements of this debate. I agree with you, sir. The Premier has been under considerable strain in the last month. He has lost two cabinet ministers. He now should lose a third, and only by the assertion of his personal indignation and the support we have seen expressed by the people other than his principal ministers—he would be lost in this as well.

I could say, as I have already said, that I consider the Solicitor General to be an honourable man, and when he says he was ignorant of what happened in his office I would agree with the Premier that this is correct.

When the same thing has happened previously, and I have read the report of the committee dealing with my colleague the member for Oriole, it said that ignorance is no excuse, that a cabinet minister is responsible and that

the Premier is responsible for the cabinet minister. That report was signed by the Minister of Transportation, who is not in his seat today, and by the Minister of Natural Resources, who is.

I am not sure why a change in focus on that matter would arouse the Premier's indignation, but if he simply rejects the justice and fairness in that comparison, then how can he possibly defend the indefensible in a situation such as this?

Hon Mr Rae: I guess when it comes right down to it, I simply do not accept the fairness of the comparison. Others have raised instances with respect to other situations on ministerial resignations. Let me also remind the members, for example, that we had a couple of days in here when part of the former Treasurer Frank Miller's budget was found in a garbage can. I can remember the then Premier William Davis stating very clearly that in those circumstances it would be very unfair, given that it was a mistake that was completely unauthorized. When Michael Wilson's resignation was called for, even by my own federal leader, I said in this House I thought that was totally unjustified, given that he had no knowledge or inkling and could not be in any sense held responsible for that.

We have a clear instance here where there is no question that the Solicitor General was in no sense involved in this letter, was in no sense involved with the content of the letter, did not authorize it, had nothing to do with it at all and was totally unaware of it until he stepped out into the lobby yesterday. To demand somebody's resignation in those circumstances would be quite unfair, I believe, all things considered in terms of the fairness of the situation.

Mr Nixon: I ask the Premier to think about what was in the mind of the justice of the peace when he received a communication in the mail with the letterhead “Mike Farnan” signed “Mike Farnan,” indicating that the Solicitor General expected him to review the matter and report before the trial date. That is exactly what it said. It is not in question.

Hon Mr Farnan: Point of privilege, Mr Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has said the letter was signed by myself—

Mr Scott: You sit down. The Premier is going to deal with this.

The Speaker: It is not a point of privilege.

Mr Nixon: How would the justice of the peace know that he had not signed it. It was on his letterhead. There was his signature. It was an instruction from the minister of the crown to withdraw the ticket before there was any court appearance. How would the justice of the peace know about that? It was a transgression of the minister's responsibility through his staff.

Interjections.

Mr Nixon: I ask the Premier, if the multitude of backbenchers would give me an opportunity, where the responsibility of a minister ends. There are clear indications signed by the minister for certain members of his staff to affix his signature, presumably, or to take responsibility for decisions of the Solicitor General. Where does that stop?

Where does the responsibility for the minister's staff stop? The overall responsibility for that letter lies with the minister, although he says somebody else did it and he knew nothing about it. It was an intrusion into the administration of justice and that cannot be changed. How can the Premier justify that?

Hon Mr Rae: Let me ask the Leader of the Opposition a question. Is he saying—

Interjections.

The Speaker: The procedures we do have established give us difficulty from time to time without establishing a new one. Could the Premier respond.

Hon Mr Rae: Thank you, Mr Speaker: I will respond. I would like to say to the Leader of the Opposition—this is now the third or fourth time, having heard him on the radio this morning as well as in the House—that he keeps on referring to something being signed by “Mike Farnan.” He knows that is not true. He has already said he accepts—

Mr Nixon: Is the Premier accusing me of lying?

Hon Mr Rae: No, I am not.

Mr Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask the Premier to withdraw. He has seen a copy of the letter. It is on Farnan's letterhead. The signature is “Mike Farnan,” and typed under it is “Mike Farnan.” What is the justice of the peace to think? It says “Mike Farnan”; he is responsible for it.

The Speaker: The member rose on a point of order. There clearly is a difference of opinion.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: What the letter says is—it was signed “Mike Farnan, pp BL.” I think it is important to say that.

Mr Elston: It's the signature of Mike Farnan.

Hon Mr Rae: No, I think it is important for people to know it is not the Solicitor General's signature. He did not sign the letter. It was not authorized by him. He knew nothing about it until he heard about it yesterday. It was in no way authorized by him. I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that I can think of many instances where staff people of various kinds have done things or have been accused of things. When Mr Ashworth resigned, did David Peterson resign as well? I do not recall that happening.

Interjections.

1430

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please. To all the members of the House, while I truly appreciate the sensitivity of the issue, including the history that goes with this matter and related matters and how members on both sides of the House feel about it, frankly I do not believe that we should continue to conduct the public business in this way. We have, I tell members, one more opportunity this afternoon.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Members, I do not intend to allow a House to be disorderly.

Mr Scott: I confess that when I came here this session I did harbour the suspicion that the new government would not be able to perform all the promises that it had made in the election: I understood that, though I did not accept it. I

did believe, because I had known the Premier for many years and I have respect and affection for him, that the guidelines that he announced would be honoured by him.

I say through you, Mr Speaker, to the Premier and the people of the province that we face a reality—and it is not too late—in which the Premier's very integrity as the custodian of the guidelines he set for himself is squarely at stake. There is time to turn back from this lip and apply the rule that has universally been applied in the case of ministers of the crown, and it is not too late. The Premier has guideline 18, which speaks only of ministers. It does not speak of executive assistants or constituency staff, and that, of course, is the excuse that is used to exclude the minister from the guideline: It was not done by him; it was done by his staff, unknowing.

I want to ask the Premier—before we get into the kinds of arguments that he has been making today which rather sound like those of a Philadelphia lawyer—if he would be good enough to tell us if he will amend the guidelines so constituency and office staff and executive assistants will lead to ministerial responsibility, or failing that, will he tell us what advice he has given to his ministers in the event that this happens again?

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, I want to say very directly to the member for St George-St David that the letter that was written should not have been written. I do not think that is in question. That is admitted by everybody. It is certainly admitted by me. It is certainly admitted by everyone on this side. There is no question. A letter of that kind is not appropriate. I would ask the member for St George-St David to extend his imagination for a moment. It was a letter written by somebody who had been on staff in the constituency office in Cambridge for a very few weeks. The letter was not authorized by the minister. It was not seen by the minister. It was not signed by the minister. It was not known to the minister until he walked out of here yesterday.

I have to say, the guideline says very clearly that “ministers shall not communicate.” The minister did not communicate. He did not communicate in any way, shape or form. Communication means you pick up the phone, as happened with George Kerr, as happened with John Munro, as happened with Bud Drury. It means that the minister has to do something, as happened with Ken Keyes and in other situations. In this situation the minister did not do anything. I have to ask myself the question, what have we come to in this Legislature when we are going to be demanding the resignation of ministers when they have not done anything at all?

Mr Scott: It is an important matter to hold a government together and a cabinet together. We have all been there. We understand these things, But the Premier understands well that his integrity as the first citizen of the province is clearly at issue and I encourage him: it is not too late to turn back. This is not the decision that the Premier would have made before 6 September and it is not the decision that his party would have made before 6 September. As my leader has pointed out, it was NDP members of the committee who said ignorance is no excuse.

I want to say this to the Premier. He knows it is not a question of fairness. It was not fair that the Minister of Health had to go. It is a question of responsibility.

An hon member: Responsible government.

Mr Scott: An important phrase. He knows that the most serious offence that can occur is an interference with the judiciary. There is no single recorded instance in our parliamentary history where a minister or his agent, knowing or unknowing, has interfered with a judge and who, whether it be fair or not, has not stood aside for the time being. When is the Premier going to, and I pray he will do it, save his reputation and do what justice and responsible government require?

Hon Mr Rae: I want to say very directly to the former Attorney General that I believe as strongly in integrity and in justice and in responsible government as he does. I hope he would be broad-minded enough and dispassionate enough to recognize that one can have differing views in judging and in assessing an individual situation.

The examples which he has referred to are all examples where ministers themselves—which he has referred to with respect to the administration of justice going back—have either allegedly been involved or in fact been involved. In this instance I had to look at a situation and have today to look at a situation and ask myself whether in the circumstances it makes any sense in terms of what responsible government is supposed to be all about.

He makes the comparison with the member for Ottawa Centre. The member for Ottawa Centre spoke the words herself in this Legislature and she, with great dignity and with great speed, came forward and said that. So there is no question of our willingness on this side to take our lumps and to take responsibility, but there is a determination on our part on this side to be realistic and to be fair and to exercise a degree of common sense when looking at a situation. A five-week probationary employee writes a totally unauthorized letter, an inappropriate letter, to a justice of the peace. I do not happen to think that a minister of the crown should have to resign for that. I just do not think it is fair.

1440

Mr Scott: I challenge the Premier to look at the precedents which give the lie to the point he makes. There is simply no precedent in our parliamentary history where a minister of the crown or his agent, knowing or unknowing, has interfered with the justices before a pending trial. It is not a question of fairness. It is not a question of whether it is good for the Solicitor General or good for the Premier or not. It is not a question about survival of government. It has to do with the integrity of the justice system, and the Premier has the opportunity to say that.

The justice who received this letter is not a calligraphy expert. He did not know who signed it. It might have been signed by Mrs Farnan for all we knew. The reality is that there is no recorded instance in our judicial history or our parliamentary history of this. I ask the Premier, whose reputation I respect—and this will be a turning-back point—to please turn back. This is not the line that this government, or the people who elected it, should really

take. I ask the Premier, will he consider issuing an apology to the judiciary for what has occurred in this instance, and issue new rules so it will not occur in the future?

Hon Mr Rae: Since the member has said some things about me, let me say that perhaps one's opinion of his reputation changed when he became the Attorney General of Ontario. I say very directly to him that we have a situation here—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: Well, the member for St George-St David—

Mr Scott: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: What is that first observation supposed to mean, that my reputation changed when I became Attorney General of the province? All it is is a smear.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me answer the question very directly. I have already said to everybody, and I will say it again here, the letter should not have been written. Letters should not be written to JPs or to anybody else.

The point is this. The letter was not authorized in any way, shape or form by the Solicitor General. It was not authorized by him, it was not written by him, and it was not signed by him. It was not approved by him, and I think that is the essential fact of this situation, which members of the opposition continue to refuse to listen to.

Mr Harris: We would like to try to understand what it is the Premier wants us, and all those concerned about the integrity of the justice system, to believe.

He has said in response to one question today that we are talking about a junior employee of five weeks, on probation. I would like to deal with that first before we get to some other matters.

The statement that was made by the Solicitor General says today that the letter was "written by one of my constituency staff who was on probation and who sought direction from a more experienced staff member." So we are not dealing with somebody on five weeks' probation.

Second, the Solicitor General says as well, "I was also informed that a second letter was written, in March of this year"—a similar letter—"to another justice of the peace by another member of my constituency staff," so I presume that we are now dealing with three members of the constituency staff, and it sounds like at least two of them with significant experience, probably not on probation.

Clearly, I think the Premier would understand that the justice of the peace would have no way of knowing this letter was not authorized by the Solicitor General. I do not know anybody who signs letters that way, if it is not authorized. He may not have been available to sign what he knew was going out; otherwise, surely the constituency person would have signed his or her own name, and that was not the case.

Yesterday, the Premier will note, I said I thought we needed to hear a little more and get an investigation. I would like to ask him this, and surely he has found this out: Who authorized three staff people in the Solicitor General's office to sign letters, using the Solicitor General's name, on his behalf without any knowledge of what those letters were? Who authorized that?

Hon Mr Rae: I can only tell the member that, in this instance, the Solicitor General has told me very clearly that he never authorized the sending of the letter, that he never authorized the use of his signature. In that circumstance, I have to say to the member that I think the commonsense reaction of most people out there would be that a mistake was made in the constituency office, an error of judgement, and that to ask the Solicitor General to resign because of that, in the circumstances, would simply be a very exaggerated and unfair response to the situation.

Mr Harris: The question is very specific. The Premier has said that he accepts the Solicitor General's word, and so do I; I think he is an honourable man. His word is that he did not know this specific letter was going out with his name attached to it. I ask the Premier again: Who authorized staff members to sign any letter with the Solicitor General's name? Who was responsible for saying to staff, "Go ahead, sign my name to anything you want"? Did the Premier ask the Solicitor General that, because I have not heard him suggest that there is any denial of that? Clearly, if that is the case, he then, as Solicitor General, is responsible and has given that responsibility to staff members, including five-week probationary staff members.

Does that sound to the Premier like somebody who is deserving of responsibility as the chief law officer of the crown? I ask him as well, is that acceptable to him, that permission was given apparently by the Solicitor General for any of his staff members to sign letters with his name on his behalf, because I do not find that very responsible?

Hon Mr Rae: I can only tell the leader of the third party that the document that he is referring to is signed "Mike Farnan pp BL." I can only tell the leader of the opposition that I have the word of the Solicitor General that he knew nothing of this letter, that he did not authorize it, that he did not authorize the use of his name on that letter and that the letter went out without his approval. I think that point has to be made: The letter went out without any approval from the Solicitor General whatsoever.

Mr Harris: Does "BL" stand for blinkers?

Let me ask the Premier this. His guidelines have clearly been violated. I do not think there is any question of that. I am shocked that he has not admitted that and the Solicitor General has not admitted that. What the Premier has said is that he is blaming a five-week probationary employee. In 1972, Darcy McKeough, then the Treasurer, resigned because an official within his ministry stamped his name on a subdivision plan. Mr McKeough had a 1/12 interest in that subdivision property.

1450

An hon member: That was a different story.

Mr Harris: It is a different story. Mr McKeough was unaware that an application had been made for a subdivision. He had no knowledge that a plan had come forward. He resigned because an official within the ministry stamped his name on a subdivision plan.

He took responsibility for what a staff member did completely without his knowledge. He did not even know there was anything there, in a similar situation with the Solicitor General. The House was not even sitting, the

Premier was out of the country, but he came forward and said, "Somebody has to be responsible when these things happen"—not a staff member, not an official of the ministry; the minister.

Does the Premier not agree that his guidelines have been violated and somebody has to accept responsibility for that?

Hon Mr Rae: I am glad that—not glad, but the member referred to the Darcy McKeough example. Let me refer him to the Globe and Mail, 28 August 1972, "Darcy McKeough Knew South Chatham Land Was Being Subdivided, Brother Stewart Says."

If the member wants to make the examples and wants to make the comparisons, we can do that. I do not know of any circumstance that fits into this particular category where somebody in a constituency office, in a way that is quite unauthorized, quite different—the Darcy McKeough example, four days after it was revealed that he had approved plans for a subdivision in which he had a financial interest; it strikes me that that is a rather different instance.

The comparison that I made was with those situations where a member of the public service, or a member of a minister's staff, does something of which the minister is completely unaware, about which the minister knows nothing and which has been completely unauthorized by the minister. In that circumstance, I just think it is unfair to demand the minister's resignation, that is all.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party has the floor.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party is entitled to place another question.

Mr Harris: I have here a letter dated 4 April to, "The Honourable Ed Philip, 3rd Floor, Ferguson Block," a member of this cabinet, presumably received around 6 or 7 April, given Her Majesty's improved mail service over the last number of years. This letter is signed, "Yours sincerely, Mike Farnan, pp BL." Written underneath is "Mike Farnan, MPP," similar to the way the other letter was signed. The letter begins:

"Dear Mr Philip:

"I enclose for your information a letter I have sent to Mr Ramnarine, justice of the peace."

The letter referred to clearly is a copy of the letter that was sent by Mr Farnan to the justice of the peace.

Could the Premier tell me when a member of his cabinet brought to his attention that he was aware and had a copy of a letter that was sent by his fellow cabinet colleague to a justice of the peace.

Hon Mr Rae: The minister has never seen that letter; never seen it.

Mr Harris: This is the member who was not here a little earlier when the Leader of the Opposition referred to the committee members who said "ignorance is no excuse." Here we have what appears to be a conspiracy of silence that is only coming to the public fore obviously

through brown envelopes, not through the responsible people whom it should be coming through.

The Premier has a member of his cabinet who has had a copy of this letter in his office probably for two or three weeks. Nothing has come forward from that. Nobody has come to the Premier with that. I have not heard him today apologize to the justice of the peace, who had no way of knowing that the Solicitor General himself did not sign or authorize that letter. We have clearly brought the integrity of the relationship of the Solicitor General and the police into serious suspect and into question.

I again remind the Premier that whenever this has happened any time in the past, somebody has accepted responsibility. Is the Premier going to accept this responsibility, or is it his Solicitor General who has authorized staff to write letters, signing his name?

Hon Mr Rae: There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that the Solicitor General ever authorized this correspondence. There has not been one shred of evidence produced by the opposition in 40 minutes of questioning to indicate that the Solicitor General knew for one second about any of this until he stepped outside yesterday; not one shred of evidence to that effect.

Mr Harris: I have a letter dated 4 February to Miss Cindy Goodall of Orillia from the Office of the Premier of Ontario. It is signed, "Sincerely, Bob Rae."

When he was questioned about the contents of this letter, his director of policy told the Orillia Sun the Premier did not write it, did not see it, certainly did not sign it, and furthermore the letter did not accurately reflect the government's position. It was written by a civil servant and it was signed "Bob Rae" by an autopen. The Premier does not even have control over his own office. The integrity of any letter now that goes out of his own office is, "We do not know whether he saw it, agrees with it or it is government policy." It means next to nothing.

Would the Premier not agree that this lack of control has contributed as well to the Solicitor General's laissez-faire attitude which has led him to be responsible for the breaking of the Premier's cabinet guidelines?

Hon Mr Rae: The guidelines say that a minister should not contact the judiciary. A minister has not contacted the judiciary. Let's be very clear about that. I think that at some point one has to try to make an assessment that deals with the reality of the situation. The Solicitor General did not write the letter. He did not sign the letter. He did not authorize the letter. He did not know anything about it. The letter should not have gone out. It is as simple as that.

Mr Elston: I have a question for the Premier. The explanation accepted by the Premier to guard against the dismissal of his minister is that a novice female employee must bear the responsibility for this transgression. As he allows his minister to hide behind his employees, I would like the Premier to tell me what the Solicitor General has told him that allows the Premier to believe that he is in compliance with section 24 of the Premier's guidelines, which specifically state that when acting on behalf of constituents, they "shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that

their office as minister is not used to further the interests of the constituent"?

1500

Hon Mr Rae: I can only tell the member what I have already said, and that is that there is no evidence that the Solicitor General ever authorized the letter. There is no evidence that he suggested or that he did it. Let us try to look at this in a reasonable way and say that, in the circumstances, to suggest that the Solicitor General should bear the responsibility for everything that goes on all over—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: That is not the way the world works; it is not the way the Constitution works; it is not the way the realities work. When Frank Miller's budget was found outside, Frank Miller did not have to resign, because it was not his fault. The sending of this letter was not the Solicitor General's fault. It is as simple as that.

Mr Elston: As the Premier stands in his place and deserts the novice female employee to an unknown fate and allows his minister to hide behind this novice female employee, can he tell this House how it is that he is allowing the Solicitor General to stand in his place and say that the probationary employee is to be blamed when she was not in fact following instructions that were given down through the chain of command in the member's office, or is the Premier saying that, even though this person was a probationary employee, the Solicitor General gave her carte blanche to do whichever action she deemed appropriate for the constituent?

Either way, the Premier has deserted this female employee and has decided to stand up for the Solicitor General. Why is he willing to support this type of activity in this House at this particular time?

Hon Mr Rae: I am the first one to say that an innocent mistake was made. I have no reason to believe that it was any other than that. I would say to the member for Bruce that again he is asking me—people are saying, "Well, what is your standard?" My standard is when people are at fault, they take responsibility for it. There is no evidence that the minister is at fault in this situation, none at all, none.

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Solicitor General. In his capacity as Solicitor General, as minister of the crown, as MPP for Cambridge, without any reference to the specific letters, without any reference to this specific case before us, can he tell this House whether he allows or has permitted in the past or authorized, any of the three, members of his staff to sign his name to correspondence that is generated in his constituency office?

Hon Mr Farnan: On matters of routine correspondence, I have given my permission to my staff to take this action. On matters that should be brought to my attention, I ask that they be brought to my attention when I visit the constituency office, and that is very clear.

Mr Harris: I thank the Solicitor General for the response. He has then authorized staff to sign his name, not constituency staff's, because he wants the weight of his

name to go forward in these requests on behalf of his constituents—not the constituency assistant, but something that will bring it to somebody's attention. He wants the weight of his name, minister of the Crown, Solicitor General of the province, in charge of all the police of the province, so this has been the practice in his office. This is in fact what he wants to happen. Otherwise, she would sign her own name.

Would the Solicitor General not agree with me that, having given this authority to his staff—not the five-week staff, because it was a senior member whom she consulted before it was signed—he is responsible for what goes out under his name? In this case, what went out in his name violated the Premier's guidelines, and to avoid any further embarrassment, he should do what every Solicitor General who has preceded him in government has done and offer his resignation.

Hon Mr Farnan: First of all, let me say that very consciously I have given direction that the stationery of the Solicitor General or the Ministry of Correctional Services should not be used in my constituency office on behalf of constituents. I draw that very clearly and indeed that my role as a minister should not be used, that I should be MPP, member for Cambridge.

I want to say this, Mr Speaker: I have never authorized such letters, I have never signed my name to such letters, and indeed I believe that it is absolutely imperative that the Solicitor General keeps at arm's length from all of this and from the judiciary.

I would finally make this comment: My conscience is clear because I did nothing wrong.

The Speaker: New question, the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr Dadamo: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

Interjections.

The Speaker: There are a number of members waiting to place their questions. Would the member for St George-St David come to order, please?

Interjection.

The Speaker: At this point all I require is your attention. The member for Windsor-Sandwich is patiently waiting to place a question.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mr Dadamo: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It is no secret that the province of Ontario loses over \$1 billion annually to several US states by way of cross-border shopping and that mayors of border cities have banded together in hopes of trying to find a solution. People from my riding of Windsor-Sandwich are spending millions of dollars in the state of Michigan. What is the ministry doing to assist businesses and to keep shoppers on this side of the border?

Hon Mr Pilkey: Federal government policy, whether by design or not, seems to be encouraging shopping in the United States.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please.

1510

Interjections.

The Speaker: I am well aware of the numbering system. I am also aware that there seem to be questions that people do not like hearing and there are responses that people do not like hearing. But every person has a right to be heard. That at this moment includes the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Would you please supply him with your attention.

Hon Mr Pilkey: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but the opposition benches are not interested. I could certainly confer with my colleague after the session is over.

The Speaker: That would make me happy too. Would the member succinctly place an answer.

Hon Mr Pilkey: Notwithstanding that, given there is considerable interest of the citizenry in Ontario, I will continue to respond to the member for Windsor-Sandwich. We have a great concern about cross-border shopping, as I believe all members of this House do. As I indicated, by design or otherwise, many of the difficulties arisen or the circumstance that sets up this problem are the result of federal government legislation.

We, quite frankly, face a situation. We are limited to treating the symptoms, and it is the federal government that refuses to provide the cure. As recently as last Friday, I met with a delegation of mayors from the cross-border cities, headed by a former colleague of mine, John Millson, who is the mayor of Windsor. They sought my support and they received it.

In addition, through the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology, we have, through Small Business Ontario, provided funds for a marketing framework for border communities to help safeguard their circumstance and to assist them in doing a greater volume of business.

All members of this House who have followed the media will recall reports from—

The Speaker: Perhaps the member has a supplementary. No supplementary? Decide. Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: The Solicitor General, in response to a question from the leader of the third party, indicated that he had authorized his employee to sign routine correspondence. I think it is an indication perhaps of the inappropriate judgement of the minister's employee but also of the minister that such would be the case.

I ask you, Mr Speaker—you have been a member of this House for many years—and other members who would be listening to the question: Have they under any circumstances given the authority to any individual to sign their name to correspondence, routine or otherwise, unless the signature on the specific letter was authorized? I do not believe there is an instance.

The Premier, who is extremely busy, is availing himself of the modern technology and has some sort of machine to sign his name, probably, to 50th-anniversary letters and, in the instance raised by the leader of the third party, to some damned-fool letter about something that had

to be retracted, and I know he would not do that again. But the Treasurer would understand that he has to spend a lot of time signing all sorts of documents that cannot be signed by anything except his own hand.

I say to you, Mr Speaker, and to the Premier through you, does he know of any other member of his cabinet or any member of this House or any person in business or with any responsibility of any significance who gives a blanket authorization for the signature of his name for any sort of correspondence without specific authorization of the letter?

Hon Mr Rae: The volume varies tremendously.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: No, it varies tremendously. No, listen to the answer. The range of correspondence varies.

The Leader of the Opposition has done it again. He has characterized something that the minister said as giving a blanket authorization. That is not what the minister said. That is not what the minister stated. The Leader of the Opposition stands up and says that is what he said. He did not say that. In the circumstances, let's be fair. I have said the letter should not have been written; the letter was not authorized; the letter should not have gone out. The minister is fully in agreement with that. There is no division of opinion on that.

Mr Nixon: The Premier once again has indicated that I am somehow distorting what the minister has said. The minister clearly said that he has authorized his junior employee to sign his name—that is, the minister's name—to routine correspondence. My question is, this is unheard of. Nobody does that, and if anybody does, he or she should be dismissed, because that is not the way you do business.

I would like to put a further question to the Premier. We now know that the Minister of Transportation, that arbiter of morality in this government, had received a copy of this letter and he whispered to the Premier, as the Premier turned to him for advice, that he had not seen the letter.

I would simply ask any member of the cabinet if he or she does not see all of the correspondence that comes to his or her office. If they dismiss that, then surely the responsibility is with their deputy or some other authority to review the correspondence and see that it is properly answered. Would the Premier not agree that a letter such as this, an interference purportedly signed by the Solicitor General, directed to a judge, would electrify Mr Morality, and if not him, every one of his employees, who would immediately ring the panic bells that would be heard all the way to the Premier's office? Would the Premier not agree?

Hon Mr Rae: I would say in answer and in direct response to the Leader of the Opposition, to simply give him the answer very explicitly that I gave before, that the Minister of Transportation never read the letter which he is referring to.

Mr Harris: I would like to ask a question directly of the Minister of Transportation. I have a copy of a letter that was written to him on 4 April in his capacity as Minister of Transportation. This is a letter that not only comes to the

minister from an MPP; it comes to him from an NDP MPP and in fact it comes to him from one of his fellow cabinet colleagues.

He has indicated through his whisperings to the Premier that he has not seen this letter. Would the minister tell us what the procedure is in his ministry for letters that come directly to him as minister, in this case one asking him to fix a ticket, letters that come to him from his fellow cabinet ministers. Could he tell me the procedures of his ministry as to where that type of letter goes and how it is handled.

Hon Mr Philip: The inquiries concerning licences are routinely sent, not to me, not to my political staff, but to the bureaucracy. They are sent to the licensing assistance section. That is what happened with this letter, and I am told by the staff, after I made an inquiry into this, that this has happened under my ministry and under the previous governments—both governments—that this is a routine procedure that has always happened.

Mr Harris: What the minister is telling us is that letters directed to him as minister by fellow cabinet ministers are never seen by the minister or never seen by the minister's political staff, but in fact go directly into the bureaucracy, if I understand what he is telling us and he wants us to understand here. In light of that, does the minister see any reason why a member of my staff and the media cannot proceed immediately over to his office to see the log on this particular letter?

Hon Mr Philip: My staff have nothing to hide. They have done this for previous governments. Any correspondence that deals with process, that deals with the administration goes automatically to the bureaucracy. This has happened, I am told, under the Liberals and under the Conservatives and that is what I have been informed. Matters that deal with policy, matters that deal with specific decision-making go to me and those are the kinds of letters that go to me and those are the ones that should go to me.

1520

ONTARIO ROUND TABLE ON ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY

Mr Waters: My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Following the release of the Brundtland commission report, local round tables began to form in communities as a means of looking at the environmental issues locally. What is the Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy doing province-wide?

Hon Mrs Grier: The Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy was appointed by the previous government and I think was a very forward-looking initiative and one which we fully supported and which I am pleased to say our government has continued and expanded and appointed new members to.

The round table on the economy under the previous government had issued a very useful challenge paper which outlined ways in which environmental and economic decision-making could be integrated. Since then, six task forces have been created to look at different sectors of the economy and to consult as to how we can in fact

achieve sustainability within those sectors. That public consultation is ongoing and is proving to be very successful.

Mr Waters: What about local groups? Can they get support?

Hon Mrs Grier: There is support for local groups. In fact, as the member, I am sure, is aware, a round table recently sponsored a workshop in Muskoka at which groups from 25 communities came together to discuss the various sectors and the consensus-building process that is occurring in their particular communities. We encourage that kind of on-the-ground initiative and are doing our best to support it and encourage it province-wide and I thank the district of Muskoka for its participation in this effort.

PETITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Brown: "To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%; and

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

HAZARDOUS WASTE

Mrs Sullivan: I have a petition to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario which reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario as follows:

"To complete an immediate and comprehensive decontamination of the site known as X-Pert Metal Finishing located at 1232 Dillon Road in Burlington, Ontario."

The petition is signed by something over 120 people from the city of Burlington. I am pleased to attach my signature, as I agree with the content of the petition.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

LAW SOCIETY AMENDMENT ACT (TEMPORARY MEMBERS), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LA SOCIÉTÉ DU BARREAU (MEMBRES PROVISOIRES)

Mr Hampton moved first reading of Bill 75, An Act to amend the Law Society Act.

M. Hampton propose la première lecture du projet de loi 75, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur la Société du barreau.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Hampton: I am pleased to today announce the introduction of An Act to amend the Law Society Act. The purpose of this bill is to allow exchange programs between crown counsel and crown attorneys in the employ of the Ministry of the Attorney General and lawyers from foreign jurisdictions. This will enable the ministry to enhance its professional development programs.

The bill permits the law society, upon the request of the Attorney General, to admit to the practice of law in Ontario lawyers who are not Canadian citizens or permanent residents. This temporary membership carries with it all of the rights and responsibilities accorded to lawyers, save the right to vote in law society elections.

FRAUDULENT DEBTORS ARREST REPEAL ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 ABROGEANT LA LOI SUR L'ARRESTATION DES DÉBITEURS EN FUITE

Mr Hampton moved first reading of Bill 76, An Act to repeal the Fraudulent Debtors Arrest Act.

M. Hampton propose la première lecture du projet de loi 76, Loi portant abrogation de la Loi sur l'arrestation des débiteurs en fuite.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Mr Hampton: I am pleased today to announce the introduction of An Act to repeal the Fraudulent Debtors Arrest Act. The Fraudulent Debtors Arrest Act has been part of Ontario law in its present form since 1909. Its history can be traced back to pre-Confederation days, when property rights were often viewed as more important than the civil rights of people. This bill will remove from the statute book a method of arresting and imprisoning a citizen for civil debt, which outside the context of family law is archaic.

The creditors, lawyers and interest groups which the Ministry of the Attorney General has consulted unanimously endorse this bill. Fortunately, the act is rarely used now that numerous modern legal remedies which focus on the assets rather than on the person of the debtor are available. Of course, where spouses are in default of their family support obligations, the remedies provided in other legislation, including the use of imprisonment in appropriate cases, will continue to be available. The arbitrary arrest and imprisonment provisions provided in the Fraudulent

Debtors Arrest Act can no longer be tolerated, and I am pleased therefore to put before the House a bill calling for its repeal.

1530

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I wonder if we might investigate the possibility of referring the matters which have been previously discussed here in the question period dealing with the Solicitor General to an appropriate committee of the House. I wonder if I might be advised at what stage you would entertain a motion to move the discussion of that particular issue into a legislative committee, particularly the standing committee on administration of justice, which is now dealing with the entire issue of conflict of interest. I believe that only there can we deal appropriately with the matter in all of its aspects, including calling the Premier, the Solicitor General and the woman staffer who is obviously being dealt with in this matter in front of the committee. I wonder if I might ask you when such a motion would be entertained.

The Speaker: I appreciate the matter which the member brings to my attention. It is not, however, a procedural matter, but it certainly is a matter for debate within the assembly. Of course, the members may wish to discuss it with various committees. That is up to the members.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

OPPOSITION DAY

ONTARIO ECONOMY

Mr Harris moved opposition day motion 2:

That, given the continual upward pressure on provincial taxes and the continual offloading of programs on municipal governments and the ever-increasing size of the Ontario provincial debt and recognizing that these trends add to the tax burden on every citizen and result in lost jobs and lost economic opportunity, this House calls upon the Treasurer, in this year's budget, to hold the line on taxes, to freeze program offloading to the municipalities and to introduce a specific plan to establish a balanced budget and debt reduction targets over the next three years.

Mr Harris: I do not plan to speak at length right now. I wanted to get the motion introduced. I have many of my colleagues who would like to speak to this motion and I do plan to have some substantial remarks at the end of the day before this is voted on. At that particular point in time, my colleagues' arguments will have been put forward. I would like the opportunity to summarize those. I know that if any of the members of the opposition actually listen, either in the House or on their snappy new colour TV monitors in their offices, they will want to support this motion at the end of the day.

We will outline a number of concerns that we have with the lack of control over spending since this government has taken office. Quite frankly, we will point out that this has been the case for the past six years and that in fact the events and the realities of 6 September have really meant nothing towards lack of controls on spending by the Ontario government.

We also will point out that if this spending of double, two and a half times, three times the rate of inflation by the

Ontario government over the past six years is carried out by this current government, and it appears as though it will be, this is not only inflationary but is the primary government cause of higher interest rates, the primary government cause of the higher value of the dollar in this country. That Ontario is the largest province with the largest budget in fact impacts on those factors more than any other government in this country save and except the federal government. The federal government, as we know, has increased its spending less than the rate of inflation each and every one of the past six years. We have concerns about some of their other policies, as we will express from time to time; however, we are in this House to talk about the irresponsible spending of the provincial government and of the budgets that have been brought forward by Treasurers over the last six budgets. We fear that unless this Treasurer learns something from that and is prepared to act on it, we will see the same situation this year.

The motion is calling upon this Treasurer to acknowledge the irresponsibility of the spending of these past six years and to show us that in fact something different has occurred, that perhaps there is a new fiscal management, somebody who cares about the fiscal situation of this province.

We will also point out that as you increase the deficit, if this happens to be an option that is chosen by the Treasurer—we dearly hope that it is not because increasing the deficit is even worse than increasing taxes—when you increase taxes, at least you are saying, “We will be held accountable, right now, for the spending that we are proposing in this budget.” However, when you increase the deficit, what you are saying is: “We don’t want to be held accountable for all the spending we are going to do. In fact, what will happen is we will have the next year or the next generation or somebody else pay at a later date.” That is irresponsible, that is unacceptable, that is worse in fact than raising taxes.

We further will point out that if this option is chosen by the Treasurer or by the Premier as a new fiscal policy—ie, “We’ll carry on with the same spending of the past, but we will not tax people for it. We will defer the taxation by way of an increased deficit”—several things will occur.

Number one, we will see the type of situation that developed federally, where more and more of the budgets, year after year after year, cumulatively must go into interest payments and less and less and less is available for infrastructure and for social programs to help the needy.

We think it is irresponsible to have a socialist government come into this province and—if in fact the Treasurer, gosh forbid, decides to increase the deficit—put into jeopardy the ability of a government to be able to make choices and to be able to respond to those least able to fend for themselves in this society: the poor, the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the homeless. Because nothing jeopardizes the ability of a government to respond to those needs more than an increasing deficit, thereby increasing the percentage of the money that must go towards interest payments as opposed to going into programs that many Ontarians deserve and need, particularly the neediest.

These are the points that we will be bringing out. We think they are simple common sense. Every small business

person understands this, every taxpayer understands this, every home owner understands this, every apartment dweller understands this and every individual and every family who have to prepare a budget for themselves understand that if they do not live within their means this year, that if they say to themselves, "We're going to spend more than we have," they are in fact jeopardizing their own future and their children's future. That is what happens if government embarks down that path as well.

So we welcome—our party and I do—the opportunity to be able to place this motion before the House. We encourage all members of the House to participate in the debate and I look forward to all members of this Legislature embracing and endorsing a straightforward, common-sense motion, the kind which we have heard the Treasurer and the Premier speak at great length about in opposition, that they think a balanced budget is important, fiscal responsibility is important.

Now they are in government they have an opportunity to do something different than what has been done federally over the last 25 years, particularly in that period of 15 years to 25 years ago. They are starting out at this same point in time when the Liberal government in Ottawa limited the choices, limited the options. No government now, federally, has any choices because so much is going into interest, and it is a shame.

1540

Here in Ontario, where we still have choices, we still have options, we still can say we are going to help the poor, we are going to help the needy, it would be a shame if this Treasurer embarks down a path whereby in the future we will not have those choices any longer. There will not be any choice. The big piece of the pie will go to pay interest and we will not have the option or the choices of providing assistance and help to those who most need it. I think that if all members understand that, they will want to support this motion.

Mr Christopherson: It is becoming a little tiresome—not to get up and debate the issue, because nothing pleases us more than to get up and talk about what we are doing and how we are handling the economy and indeed the recession that we face. However, particularly from the third party, we continuously hear the same simplistic formula that causes the same sort of response from us time and time again, and that is that there should not be any spending of public funds because it jeopardizes our financial position. The difficulty with that, as we have said before, is that it completely ignores the need of tens of thousands of Ontarians who are suffering because of this recession.

There are a number of initiatives which this government has taken which the third party continues to ignore except when it is fashionable for the question period of the day to stand up and speak out the other side of its mouth and demand to know where the funding is for this issue, that issue and the next, quite frankly trying to rake this government over the coals for not doing enough.

Interjection.

Mr Christopherson: It becomes tiresome continuously dealing with these kinds of resolutions and motions and then watching, day after day, as members of the third party stand in their place and talk the message of no expenditures, no tax increases, no increase in the deficit and yet they are fully prepared to stand up and say that not enough is being done in this area and that area and the next.

Interjection.

Mr Christopherson: As the government of the day, we are doing what I think the public in Ontario expects us to do, and that is very simply to do everything we can to address the needs of real people who are hurting without damaging the economic base of this province, not just for today but for the recovery, which we are doing—

Interjection.

Mr Christopherson: —everything we can to accelerate, so that when that recovery comes we will have a strong Ontario and bring us not only back to where we were but even further and stronger, which is where we ought to be. Those are the kinds of measures that we have taken, and those, I believe—

Interjection.

Mr Christopherson: —are the kinds of measures that we are going to see a week from yesterday when indeed the new budget comes down.

I think it was also important for all of us to take note that just the other day one of the leading bond-rating agencies, and I am paraphrasing because I do not have the clip right in front of me, talked about the fact that it understands a deficit in recessionary times and that by and large it considers the Ontario economy to be strong, to be healthy. Now I am paraphrasing, but I believe that is the essence of what that report said.

Mr Carr: They better be saying that a year from now.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Oakville South, the member for Grey. I would ask you to refrain from heckling.

Mr Carr: Sorry. I get carried away. It's an emotional issue.

Mr Christopherson: Mr Speaker, you take all the fun out of it. I am not used to speaking in this House with all that noise going on around me. Quite frankly, it will be a unique and new experience.

It also needs to be said, because indeed the opposition is going to take the opportunity to bash the other way, the importance of the kind of actions that this government has taken with regard to the recession: The \$700-million anti-recession fund is having and will continue to have an impact on municipalities and communities across this province. Again, that is not just money, make-work projects, money that is being thrown out there to try to cover over the recessionary problems, no. This money is targeted. It is an investment in the infrastructure of our municipalities.

That is going to put us in a much stronger position when the recovery begins to affect us and we can build on the kind of expenditures we have made. I, along with my caucus colleagues, am prepared to stand behind

those results. Although we get a few shots here and there from the opposition, by and large there is still not a lot of serious criticism about that program, nor is there any evidence to say that it is not having the kind of impact that the Treasurer and this government said it would have.

Further to that, we cannot say enough. The importance of one of the first measures this government took was to keep \$500 million in the pockets of consumers, not to tax the retail sales tax on top of the GST. That has kept \$500 million in the pockets of consumers and that has gone a long way, or at least a good measure, to assisting people in being able to respond to the recession that we find.

In closing, I would just say that, rather than rehashing a lot of the old arguments today which is quite frankly what we are all going to do, but never deny an opportunity to talk about an important issue like the economy, the really important economic debates for all of us are going to come following the budget on Monday. I think we are prepared as a government and as caucus members to stand behind that budget and it is those debates that are much more relevant to the listening public than this particular debate, although I do say all of us enjoy and respect the opportunity to address Opposition Day issues, particularly when they talk about the most important issue facing us right now and that is the economy and the recession.

Mr Bradley: I am going to take a bit of a different approach than the previous two speakers have taken on this. I think the resolution is a useful one in that it allows the Legislature to focus on expenditures by government; those which are productive at the time of a recession and those which are less productive and certainly should be curtailed or restrained at a time when the government is attempting to find money to channel into areas which could in fact produce jobs in the province of Ontario.

Essentially what a lot of people in the province perhaps do not recognize is that most of that is done not in Treasury itself, though Treasury has a very important role to play, but in the Management Board of Cabinet. As we know, the Chair of Management Board has a new responsibility as Minister of Health as well. I hope she will have sufficient time to concentrate on her role and responsibility as Chair of Management Board, because it is going to be important if the government is going to have sufficient funds to be able to channel into productive and useful capital projects by either accelerating the date of those projects, or perhaps initiating projects which are beneficial to the province, particularly as they relate to the multiplier effect in each of the communities as these are initiated.

We think of such things as hospitals and I think of the Niagara region, the announcements which were made by the previous Minister of Health in the previous administration. I would hope that those would proceed quickly. I have not heard some of the announcements in that regard, but those are the kinds of projects that (a) are going to be useful to the community in the long run, and (b) are going to be useful in the short run in that they will create jobs in those communities. To do that, the Management Board has to look very carefully at the expenditures of each of the ministries because, particularly being a new government with a new agenda, the agenda for power, they will have

each of the ministers coming in, asking the Treasurer and asking the Management Board chair if they can have all kinds of new money for that ministry.

1550

If they looked at it on an individual basis, one might be sympathetic to that. I can recall, as Minister of the Environment, I was always looking for all kinds of funds for the ministry and we indeed did have an increase of over 100% in the ministry when I was there, so I know what that is like. But I know as well that the government has to look at its priorities, and the Treasurer particularly, I think, would feel this to be important because he knows that he has to produce a budget. He has to deal with revenues and he has to deal with expenditures, so he has to have the assistance of other members of the cabinet in not proceeding with some desirable programs, perhaps, at this time, or perhaps ending certain programs which no longer have a usefulness as we are into the 1990s, except to look carefully at each of those expenditures. That is how you keep the deficit down.

I suspect, as I said in the House before, some of the friends of the government will try to float numbers that are high. They will say, "Oh, the deficit is going to be \$12 billion, or something of that nature." I think the term for that is highballing, and that is so if the Treasurer comes in with his budget at some other figure. It reminds me of going to a clothing store where they have something on sale for \$7.99. Now, everybody knows that after you get through with the tax, anyway, that is \$8. You really fooled no one.

But I suspect this government will attempt to persuade people that the deficit is not as high. I know they will be involved in all kinds of schemes. They will look at British Columbia and try to take some of this debt away and put it somewhere else, so it does not show on the government books. Certainly W. A. C. Bennett was one of the people who did that, and I know many of the people who are sitting on the other side of the House are apostles of W. A. C. Bennett and others in British Columbia in those days.

The resolution deals with the deficit. I do not think anybody in this province realistically expects that the Treasurer of this province, in the midst of a deep recession, with unemployment at the rate it is at, at the present time, can reasonably expect that he will run no deficit and that he will run a surplus. That simply cannot be the case.

This year we saw, as the economy went, right across this country but particularly in Ontario, into a recession, the deficit began to increase. Next year he has got to be able to fight the recession, so one would anticipate some kind of deficit. What we really do not want to see on this side of the House, and I think what people in this province do not want to see, particularly those who are looking for business opportunities in this province, is that it goes completely out of control.

We had a suggestion from the member for Hamilton Centre that somehow there was a rating agency which said that everything would be fine and that we would not lose our triple A rating. I am wondering what inside information this rating agency must have to be able to determine this even before the budget. What hints have they been

given? What materials have they seen? Have they had access to the books in the province of Ontario?

All of those are things one has to ask when the member for Hamilton Centre makes his claim, as he did one day in the House, that he was able to encourage the Minister of the Environment to speed up an environmental assessment over GO Transit in his riding. When you say that, you must say, well, what are the reasons this was said? Who had access to the books? What do they really know about the Ministry of Treasury and Economics in the province of Ontario, because they have to draw that conclusion from somewhere?

To go back to another issue, one thing I will not ask this Treasurer to do is to speed up an environmental assessment to generate economic activity in this province, because he has claimed to have been, for a long time, a person who cares about the environment. I see the Minister of Mines has entered the House. I know the Minister of Mines would not be a person who would want to see an environmental assessment speeded up just for the sake of economic activity. He would want to see a full assessment of any project coming forth, because I can well recall his environmental statements in years gone by.

The second aspect of it is that there should be no new taxes. I would say that people in this province will not be looking for new taxes, not in the midst of a recession. Now I know there are some politically attractive ones. You try to package it and you say, "Well, it's a politically attractive one and we are really doing this or we are doing that." I do not think, however, people in this province, as I say, in the midst of the deepest recession we have been in since 1982, are going to be looking for new taxes.

I encourage the Treasurer not to be raising taxes in this province at this time and discouraging people from spending, taking money out of people's pockets. In fact, he may find some taxes that are worth while cutting in the province. Members will say, "That will contribute to the deficit." It will not if it generates new economic activity. So the best brains in the Treasury department and within the government have to put their minds to what taxes they might cut which might in fact generate new revenues, even in the midst of a recession. I hope he comes forward with those kinds of tax cuts as he assesses his options.

I mention the specific capital expenditures and I will not dwell on that at some length, except to say—and this is the same as the welfare expenditures—there does not appear to be a pattern. If I were cynical, and I am not a cynical person, I might try to think that the money would simply be put into government ridings. I can recall, however, that the Treasurer of this province was long opposed to that in opposition and I would certainly say—I would be surprised, let me put it that way, if that were the criterion to be used, that it goes into government ridings only. I would be very much surprised if that were the case. So I then have to ask what criteria are being applied, because in many of the areas where unemployment is the highest, we are not seeing the kind of economic activity being generated that should be generated in this province.

I also look at the issue of business, and particularly at keeping business here and future business locating here.

Gord Wilson, who is the president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, was in St Catharines making a presentation and visiting various places within our community and in the Niagara Peninsula just last week. One of the figures he put forward which I thought was rather interesting and compelling for all of us to dwell upon was that in 1981 and 1982 some 20% of the jobs that were lost were jobs that people would not come back to. He revealed a very startling figure, I think to most people in this province, that in this particular recession, the 1991 recession, 48.3% of the people whose jobs would be disappearing would not have a job to come back to.

That means that the government of Ontario, whichever government it is, and we have a government which has been duly elected by the people, has a responsibility to attract business to this province and retain other business. You do not do that by scaring the business away. So the Treasurer and the Premier will have to perhaps accept some chiding from the opposition from time to time, some of it in a jocular sense, others in a serious sense, about not steering a straight socialist line which is designed to simply encourage anybody who was thinking about staying in Ontario to head for Tennessee or somewhere else and to discourage new investment. He would want to avoid that. So we will say that he is wearing a grey suit and the Premier is wearing a blue suit and so on, and they are being quite conservative in their approach. Only the Minister of Natural Resources is in the original NDP brown, and I commend him for that this afternoon.

But this is going to be extremely important. Even labour people in this province—and they are perceptive people, they have had to deal in collective bargaining in tough times and in good times—recognize that when they do their bargaining they have to do it with a company or with a business which is healthy, and they do not want to see those businesses disappearing. They do not want to see small plants and larger plants heading to other jurisdictions because they are afraid of what they are going to be facing in the province of Ontario. They want to see new investment coming to this province to generate jobs. That is what we will be looking for from this particular government.

1600

When the minister comes out of the recession, we expect that he is going to try to lower his deficit and eliminate that deficit, and that can happen as we pull out of that recession. One cannot realistically, in my view, express that hope in this particular fiscal year.

One of the things we do not want to happen, however, is to see some offloading taking place. They used to be critical on the other side, and the Treasurer himself when he sat on this side of the House was critical of previous governments. He has been here since 1971—it is hard to believe, but he has been here since that time—and he has been critical, along with some of his colleagues, of offloading.

We heard the promises to the Ontario Teachers' Federation and others that they would be paying 60% of the cost of education. In fact, we find out—and I found out from reading a newsletter from a teachers' federation, News Today by the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation—

that in fact the education funding has fallen from 41.5% to 40.8% in one year. This is what I call offloading.

What we are seeing is municipalities are having to cut important programs and projects and they are getting to have to raise their taxes locally because this government is prepared to offload that financial responsibility on those municipalities. I know my friends in the Ontario Teachers' Federation and each of the affiliates are not going to stand idly by while this happens, just as I know my friends on local labour councils and others who have expressed concern about this in principle in the past are going to be equally vociferous in their criticism of the present provincial government if it gets into that particular habit of offloading on to the local municipalities.

I want to leave sufficient time for my colleagues to participate in this debate. I could go on at some length about various aspects of this particular resolution, which will focus some attention on the issue of fiscal responsibility, and I do look forward to listening to my colleagues on all sides of the House debate these important financial issues of the day.

Mr Stockwell: I am happy to be standing today to discuss this motion put forward by Mr Harris on opposition day.

What I would like to deal with specifically is basically the deficit. We are into time constraints, and obviously we will have to deal with them individually.

I would like to talk about the trouble with deficits. The trouble with deficits is, it is beginning the slippery slope. The \$3 billion is now applied to the debt of this province, and the slippery slope we are on is that it becomes very difficult in subsequent budgets year after year after year to start dealing with the amount of money we have borrowed to run the province.

In essence, deficits, debts, are living beyond your means. I suppose everyone understands that. It is when you spend more money than you take in.

Businesses do not have that luxury. Municipal councils do not have that luxury. The only people that have that luxury are provincial and federal governments, which may well have a very damaging effect on their capacity to be financially frugal. Businesses do not have that luxury simply because when they borrow they must in fact build in a process to pay it back. It is called interest and principal payments. The difficulty that government enters into is that when it borrows it does not build in principal payment reduction. They only service the deficit.

So what does that mean? That means very clearly that if a government does not build in a practice to retire principal, then all that happens is the debt simply increases, and that is the slippery slope.

You always begin with a small amount of money. You always begin with a manageable debt. But the dilemma, the difficulty is that when those days come when you should be retiring that debt, the government either does not have the ability or the guts to do it, simply because it cannot defend its spending increases if it was purely tax.

The simple solution is to ask governments to retire their debt within their mandate. So if the New Democrats felt it was important to run a \$3- or \$4-billion debt this

year or next, it would be incumbent on them before their mandate elapses that they should have to retire that debt, simply because they absorb that debt on behalf of the taxpayers.

The problem is that government after government after government passes on a larger and larger and larger debt until you get to the situation that the federal government is in. The federal government is in the position where it cannot even service the interest on its debt. That is a very, very dangerous predicament, because what happens at that point is you start borrowing money to pay for the money you borrowed and you never, ever, ever get out of that spiral. You never resolve that issue, and if businesses ran into that predicament, they would eventually declare bankruptcy.

I caution the government today, when it examines its budget, when it examines the programs that it wants to institute, does it examine them in a full and comprehensive fashion? If these are programs that the Treasurer decides are important, then the Treasurer should tax the people. If these programs are necessary, then the Treasurer should tax the people. And if the Treasurer considers these programs to be worth while, then he should tax the people. If they are worth while, if they are reasonable and if they are acceptable, then stand up and defend them.

If he is not prepared to defend them, he should not spend the money. It is that simple, it is that clear and it is that concise, because if we adopt the attitude that some governments have adopted, we end up in the position of not being able to service our debt, and I do not think there has been any party in the last 20 years that has been oblivious to this attitude.

Mr Christopherson: Like the federal government. Like the Tory provincial party.

Mr Stockwell: I agree with the member. It has been shameful, it has been unfortunate, and it has been a financial disaster.

That is the problem facing the economic community today when it comes to government spending. The suggestion is that during the rough times governments can run deficits, and some Keynesian theories of economics are that you can deficit finance, thereby drive the economic engines of the regions that you represent in the House. The difficulty is that if you accept that logic and you deal with that theory, the theory also suggests that in good economic times all the debt that you have incurred during those not-so-good economic times should in fact be paid down. That is the dilemma that faces this government and has faced governments of the past. They have not paid down the debts that they incurred during the difficult times.

If the solution that this government thinks it has come up with, rather than defending spending, defending new programs and defending the rationale that it is using for increasing spending by this government, if its rationale is that it should run the deficit up, that is sadly mistaken. If he is going to spend the money, to the Treasurer, if they are going to spend the money, to the backbenchers, defend it. Have the guts to defend it to the people of this province

and raise taxes. If they are not prepared to defend it, do not spend it.

Mr Bisson: I must say that I am very, very pleased to get up today and to speak on this motion, because I think it is important that people understand what exactly is this philosophy we are trying to be told in regard to right-wing economics. We have seen this whole process of Reaganism and Mulroneyism—if I can pronounce those two words, with a certain amount of difficulty because it is one that I have a hard time saying—we have seen that balance and we have seen what the effect to our economy has been, to the detriment of the people of Canada and I think generally the people of North America. We have had a situation over the past number of years, since the early 1980s, where we have practised the exact type of policy that is trying to be put forward to us to the detriment of this country.

I would like to speak on the motion itself. There are a couple of interesting points I think in the way that the motion was put together, one of them being the size of the debt. They speak in the motion in regard to the size of the debt and try to make it look as if governments for some reason are unable to operate unless they run strictly on the amount of money that is coming in every year into the Treasury of the province, or to the country, for that matter.

1610

I would like to take that whole principle and to try to bring it over into our own economy of Ontario in regard to the average person, the average people working out there, if we were to try to do that.

I was at a chamber of commerce dinner last Wednesday in my riding in the town of Iroquois Falls, where I met with a number of leaders within the business community of that municipality, and I asked them to think about it for one second. If every Canadian or every Ontarian was to follow that type of practice within their own budgets at home, that they would not have the right to have charge cards, that they must take all of their charge cards and just get rid of them—for me, it would be a great thing; I could not spend any more—the idea of not being able to go to a bank to borrow money to be able to buy a car, to be able to purchase a home, to be able to do whatever in regard to planning a holiday for their family or anything, I would say that the economy would come to a halt very quickly, because the reality is that our economic system in this country, and for the free world, for that matter, has been set up on a means by which people pay for what they need over a period of time. It is called amortization. But if we were to try to do that, if we were to ask the consumer out there to strictly spend the amount of money that he or she gets on his paycheque every week or two weeks and only to spend that money that is coming in and not to be able to borrow any money whatsoever, the economy would come to a halt, because I say not one individual out there would be able to buy a home, would be able to buy a car, would be able to do anything over a long period of time, and it would be to the detriment of our economy.

I put to you, Mr Speaker, and I put to this House and to the people of this province that the province of Ontario, like any other government, finds itself in a situation where

there is a number of services and a number of things that we need to invest in for the long-term economic good of the province. And yes, some of those things are material things, such as buildings, such as being able to provide buildings to house the various people who need to work for the government, in order to buy the vehicles, in order to buy the equipment that it takes to run the government. The government, like everybody else, does not have an unlimited amount of money in its back pocket where it can just magically come up with it and be able to purchase this thing over a one-year period. They need to invest over the long term so that we are able to provide the services to the people of this province that they deserve, that they need, and indeed I would say that needs to be done.

As well, the province from time to time needs to borrow money in order to do other things that are not material, such as providing education to our children, such as being able to provide health care services and being able to pay the salaries of the people working within the civil service who provide all of those services for the people of this province so that we are able to have the system of care that we have developed over the years.

I ask members to think of another thing. Imagine a society, imagine an economy where the government itself would not provide any of those services that we are being told by the opposition members today are not necessary. Imagine if we were to say we will leave the whole economic situation strictly in the hands of the private sector and we were to say to them, “You’re responsible for developing the infrastructure of this province, of this country, in order to be able to do the business that is necessary.” What kinds of standards would we have in regard to providing the transportation link that is necessary for business to be able to do the things that it needs to do? I would ask, what would happen to the companies that would have to provide out of their own pockets and profits the health care service that is required by—

Mr Stockwell: Who said that? Unbelievable.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Etobicoke West, you had your chance. You exposed your ideas. It is now the turn of the member for Cochrane South.

Mr Bisson: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Yes, I have listened to his ideas, and I must say one thing. Between the Tory party and the NDP, at least we are speaking on something that we believe in. I appreciate the member’s view, but this is my chance.

To finish on that thought, if we left strictly—

Mr Harris: Why don’t you give my view then, instead of misrepresenting our view, instead of lying about our view?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Please resume your seat. Member for Nipissing, I heard you say that the member is lying.

Mr Harris: Mr Speaker, if in referring to the member, that he was misrepresenting my view, if that is not what he was doing, I will withdraw that and ask the member to give his views, not misrepresent my view.

Mr Ferguson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I did not hear the member for Cochrane South mention the

member for Nipissing at all. In fact, he was using an example—

The Deputy Speaker: This is not a point of order, please. The member for Etobicoke West, you had a point of order?

Mr Stockwell: No, he summed mine up quite well.

The Deputy Speaker: Okay. The member for Cochrane South, address your comments to the Chair.

Mr Bisson: I have been doing that, Mr Speaker. I have lost a bit of time on the clock. If possible, I would like to get it back.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, I think it is a matter of seconds.

Mr Bisson: The point I am trying to make is that the province of Ontario and the government need to provide the services and the infrastructure necessary for business to conduct itself within the province of Ontario or within the country. Yes, we need to be able to develop over a long period of time, over the future. Sometimes we must carry that cost into the future to provide the roads, to provide the hospitals and to provide the education that is needed so the workers and management can run the industry that creates the wealth within this province. Yes, in hard economic times such as we find ourselves in, in recessionary times, the government all of a sudden cannot say: "We will stop educating. We will stop building infrastructure because we're strictly in economic hard times and we have to forget what our long-term goals are."

I say that in hard economic times it is the responsibility of the government, and one that this government is taking, to make sure this infrastructure and those services over the long term remain in place and are not attacked because I say that in hard economic times it is people who get hurt. The New Democratic Party wants to make sure those people who need that help during hard economic times will get it.

We have done that in a number of ways, one of them being the anti-recession package my government announced back in November. We decided consciously to invest within the infrastructure of this province to an amount of over \$700 million. The reason we did that was twofold: First, we recognized that as a government we need to invest within the infrastructure of this province so that we may be able to create the infrastructure that is necessary to sustain business, industry and people within this province. The second thing it does, I would say, is that it also gives the opportunity for people to get back to work. If you put money in peoples' pockets through the payment they will get for labour, by providing the development of the infrastructure of this province with that \$700 million, they will then in turn have to go out and spend it to be able to buy groceries and make their payments on cars or whatever other things they need for their quality of life.

What that does, I would say, is to create a ripple effect within the economy, to be able to have other suppliers who need to supply the materials for these projects so they can get the contracts or sell the goods or services to the government. The whole thing is a ripple effect through the economy.

I say that this practice has been done in the past. This is not a new concept. It is not a concept the New Democratic Party invented last November. If we look back in our history to the time of the Great Depression—I was not even around at the time, as members might notice by my young-looking appearance—when we read the history of this country, the history of the economic situation, the governments of the day in the United States, in Canada and in other free world economic states decided they would invest money they did not have at the time to be able to put it back into their economies to get people money and get people back to work so they in turn could go out and try to rebuild the economy.

I put it to the members that if we look at the history, indeed that is what happened. The economy started to rebound and eventually things turned around. More specifically, this was done again in the late 1950s, when the American economy and the Canadian economy were going through very difficult times. The then American administration, under Mr Eisenhower, and our own Parliament of Canada, decided to diffuse money within our economies through the development of the infrastructure because they were going into a very difficult recession. If they did not put brakes on it, they felt it might go even further. They managed to put the money in at the right time before the thing got too far and the economy rebounded.

We know this practice works. At one point, yes, I agree with the members opposite that the government has to pay on the long-term debt, there is no question about it, and that is something this government will do, as any financially responsible government would.

The other thing that was said in the motion—I found this quite ironic—was that the motion speaks of offloading responsibility to municipal governments. It was only 6 September that this government, the New Democratic government, was elected to office, but I must say that this practice was in place a long time before we got here. It was the governments before us, both Liberal and Conservative, that started that practice in the province of Ontario.

I would put it to the members that it was a Conservative Party that started to cut back transfer payments to the school boards. It was done successfully through the Liberal government to other programs. They did it for their own reasons, but the opposition should not come to us and tell us we are offloading our responsibility, because I say that is something we inherited that we certainly did not put in place. Our government has started to address that situation based on the economic situation we find ourselves in.

1620

As well, if we take a look at the federal government, it had started that practice a long time ago. They offloaded their responsibility to the provinces by cutting back on our transfer payments. I say that hurts not only the provinces, but the people within them, because it endangers our programs, to be able to provide the service to the people of this province.

We look at the last federal budget. The federal government has turned around and cut transfer payments to the people across the country through the provincial governments, and what we have seen is a Newfoundland government

having to cut back 2,000 civil service workers, especially within the medical care system. That has been an erosion of our medical care system. The long-term effects can be drastic, so I find it quite ironic that this whole thing was put before us with regard to this motion of saying that somehow we are trying to offload our responsibilities on to the municipalities. I say this government has taken an opposite approach.

In closing, just one little note is that the member for London North got up in the House during question period, or just before, and spoke about our needing to invest within post-secondary education. I must agree. In the future, education is the key to making sure we have an economy that is vibrant, strong and able to change with the changing times. But members opposite should not speak to us from one side and then the other. What is it today? Are we saving or are we spending? The member should have some consistency when she comes to this government and tells us one minute that she wants us not to spend money, the next minute that she wants us to save money and the next minute that she wants us to spend money. She should be consistent in the way we should do things.

I think, unlike what we saw in question period today, if we work together as members of this House and try to solve the problems within this province, I would put to the members we might be much farther ahead. I say we must be very careful when we talk about economic issues and I think we should not mislead people into believing that the government cannot take its responsibility in providing the services to the people of this province.

This government is committed to making sure the people of the province of Ontario have in place the services that are required. We are also conscious of the fact that during hard economic times it is people who get hurt and that we need to infuse money within our social service system and also within the infrastructure, developing the infrastructure to put money in the pockets of people. With that, Mr Speaker, I would like to thank you very much and I will leave the floor to our colleagues.

The Deputy Speaker: I would just like to remind members that when you rise for a point of order you must do so from your seat.

Mr Ramsay: I am pleased to rise on the third-party motion of opposition day, the second opposition day we have the privilege to speak to in this session of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario; a motion that I think speaks to what we all need to be talking about in government today and too few of us are speaking to, and that is the responsibility of financing a government, our fiscal responsibility to the people.

I think many times we forget that we work for the taxpayers out there, the people we are addressing our comments to today. They are the people who pay the bill and they are the people whom we are ultimately responsible to. I think it is time the politicians stopped feeling that it was an infinite well of funds, and we had better start being responsive to what the taxpayers are saying.

I am very sympathetic to this offloading point that the member for Nipissing has brought forward because, as the

Speaker knows, I was a clerk-treasurer for a township for 10 years and suffered the slings and arrows of offloading from a previous government. It was a Conservative government at the time, but I accept the recanting of this member that we need to be readdressing that.

In fact, I would go farther to say that part of the constitutional difficulties to some degree in this country are being caused by an ill definition of roles and responsibilities among all three levels of government. What needs to be done as a first step in this country, to rebuild this country and form a new Canada, is to have all the provinces come to the table with the federal government, but I think for the first time to also invite the municipalities of this country to talk, because we have been in a dire competition with each other, all three levels of government in this past little while. We have been after that same taxpayer pocket.

We have had conflicting types of taxation and this GST is a prime example of that. Up until the introduction of the GST, direct sales taxes were the sole privy of provincial governments. We do not see that any more. We now see through the GST the federal government delving directly into the taxpayer's pocket. So we are in competition, all of us, all three levels of government, through those various taxation systems, for that same tax dollar the taxpayer is working so hard to hold on to.

I think we have to be holding on to that. We have to be redefining those roles. We have to be discussing among all three levels. I will tell the members why. I have been travelling a lot in this province—I will not tell the members why—talking to a lot of people, seeing what the people of Ontario are saying. I will tell the members one thing the taxpayers are saying. They have had it up to here with taxation. The people of Ontario do not want to pay any more taxes; they have really had it. I think governments have to be cognizant of that. I do not think we can be raising taxes for people any more. The answer is that we have to do better with what we have. That is the answer for government. I think that is what the member for Nipissing is getting at, that we have to be cognizant of our duties and be doing a better job.

I have some ideas for the government towards that and I would certainly hope it would listen to some of this. It might be a bit shocking for some of the members over there because of course politicians today have to make sure they say things that are politically correct.

Something that a lot of politicians do not want to address, and I am sure the politicians across the way do not want to talk about, is the issue of universality of social programs. I am sure this will get the interest of a lot of the members there. I think it will get a lot of the interest of the members in my party right here. Up until now this idea of universality has been sacrosanct. People do not want to talk about that. Politicians have to start to say that maybe we have to do better for the people who are really in need, that maybe today we no longer can have the luxury of the universality of social programs. I think all political parties are going to have to start to address that. That is very important.

We are charged by our bosses, the voters out there, with being fiscally responsible and I think we are going to have to start to look at these things. We have to make sure, with the increasing needs of people out there, that maybe it is our responsibility to start to redirect our resources to those who need them the most. I know there are a lot of difficulties in determining what that need is, but these issues have to be addressed. Politicians are going to have to have the internal fortitude to start to address these issues because the voters, again, our bosses, are crying out for that responsibility.

Another idea, and I know the Treasurer will be very interested in this because it is an issue that is near and dear to his heart, as it is to my heart, is that I would hope this government brings in a universal accident and sickness program. We have a lot of different pensions in government, through all levels of government. We have a lot of pension programs and private programs out

there to help people in need. We have to start to look at the consolidation of much of what we do as government in helping people.

Right now, if I were over there, I would be recommending to my government that we scrap the Workers' Compensation Board. I think we have to be doing that. We have to be looking at building a universal accident and sickness program. That is something I think this government should do. I know it is the policy of this political party, as we passed in a policy convention in Ottawa three years ago, and I know it is the policy of the governing party. I would challenge the Treasurer, as I would agree and support this move, that he bring in a universal accident and sickness policy. I think he can do this more efficiently than the system we have today. That is very important and he would get a broad base of support out there in the public for this beginning of the consolidation of many of the programs we have in place to help the people of this province.

This is the first step in working towards this consolidation and working towards a minimum income system that we would have in place in the next 10 years or so.

Hon Mr Laughren: Would it be no-fault?

Mr Ramsay: I have the attention of the Treasurer now and that of course has been the whole motive of my speech. With that I am so happy and will retain my seat and allow the Tories to do this.

1630

Mr Carr: I am pleased to rise and add a few points to this debate. I am going to talk about three things. I am going to talk about the tax situation; I am going to talk a little bit about the debt if I could, which was really just deferred taxes; and I am going to talk a little bit about accountable government.

To start off with, I am going to read a quote from the throne speech. It is from the throne speech that was introduced by this new government. "It is a government that will listen to the people and respond to their needs to the best of its ability."

Hon Mr Laughren: Right on.

Mr Carr: Well, I have an idea for the Treasurer—and he is saying, "Right on." We commissioned a poll, and guess what 81% of the people said? That the taxes are too high. And 77% said that they do not believe their taxes are managed properly. I might add that this poll asked also what the person's affiliation was, whether they were NDP, Liberal or Conservative when they voted last time. Guess what, folks? The NDP were just as upset with taxes as were the Liberals and the Conservatives. So it crossed all party lines. When you get to 81%, you can see why. With that high number, it included all parties, and in fact probably some of the parties that were not elected.

Also they asked, "Do you receive value for your tax dollars?" To that, 75% said no. "A law should be passed limiting government spending." And 79% said yes. Because when you look at the deficit that we are facing now—and I will just relay some of the facts that I got from legislative research. Before this government has even introduced this budget, we are now paying \$4.3 billion on interest alone this year. That works out to be—and I will round it off a little bit—\$362 million a month in interest. That is \$83 million a week, or close to \$12 million a day, in interest. That is not for new programs. That does not go to help kids in school. That does not go to help any more social programs. That goes right to interest. It works out to almost \$500,000 an hour. So as we sit here, in approximately two hours' time we will have spent \$1 million in interest alone.

If members do not believe that the deficits are a problem—and I know the Treasurer has said the deficit is not scary—I will quote to them what a famous writer said. Jeffrey Simpson says in the *Globe and Mail*, 27 February 1991, and unfortunately I believe we are heading down the same path in this province: "Ottawa became a fiscal cripple in the years 1975 to 1984, when the federal government"—under Pierre Trudeau—"accumulated nearly \$200 billion of debt. Compounded interest on that...debt cost another \$120 billion by 1989-90." In that period of time it almost doubles. So the total bill for these 10 nightmare years of economic mismanagement from 1975-84 is in the vicinity of \$320 billion.

So when the other side talks about what happened federally, let's put the responsibility back on the person who was really responsible. Members do not have to believe me. Believe a chap by the name of Jeffrey Simpson, who is a very well-known and respected writer. The responsibility for the federal debt goes on a fellow by the name of Mr Trudeau. Well, guess what? He is long gone. He is long gone, and we are still paying for it. Years later we are still paying that back.

So when we talk about debts and deficits not being a problem, I say to the Treasurer that he is wrong, because deficits are nothing but deferred taxes, and some day we are going to have to pay them. We are still paying for Mr Trudeau. Do not make the same mistake in this province that we made federally between 1975 and 1984. Let's learn our lesson from history. The member for Cochrane South talked about history. Let's learn our lessons. Let's learn from some respected people who say the deficit that we have, that is crippling this country, was created by a man

who is long gone. He gave us this debt, and guess what? He rode off into the night and left us with all the problems. I say to the Treasurer, do not do it. Do not make the same mistake in this province.

When it comes to taxes—I am reading now from some of the submissions that were before the standing committee on finance and economic affairs.

“In order to enhance the competitive position of Ontario vis-à-vis Quebec, a lower corporate income tax rate should be introduced, as in Quebec, to promote expansion and productivity of business.” That was said by the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers’ Association.

We heard, if I look through here—and they are all summarized—page after page after page of groups that came before us. The bottom line is that they said: “No new taxes.” That is what the groups are saying to the Treasurer. So if he goes back to the throne speech—he applauded this statement, and I will read it again: “It is a government that will listen to the people and respond to their needs to the best of its ability.” So there it is. The taxpayers, the people who came before that committee said—guess what?—“No new taxes.”

If members look through some of the submissions that were there: “There should be no introduction of new taxes or tax increases.” “The government should make progress towards implementing a more modern, sophisticated form of fiscal management.” “A clearer statement of the government’s financial position, through consolidated financial statements.”

So I will sum up very clearly and say to the Treasurer, who I know is working very hard; I see him on the streets late at night working on the budget, and I say to him every night as I pass him: “Mr Treasurer, no new taxes. No new taxes, Mr Treasurer.” We are going to hold it to you.

Mr Sutherland: It is a great pleasure for me to rise today and participate in this opposition day motion.

Looking at the motion for the first couple of times and reading it over and trying to get a handle on what the motion is all about, it seems very contradictory in the way it is worded. Not only does it seem that way; it definitely is contradictory.

First of all, the Conservatives have a request here to stop the continual offloading of programs on to municipal governments, and then at the same time they have a request to reduce the provincial deficit. Now, realizing that we are in a recession, realizing that provincial revenues are down and that provincial revenues are down for the first time in terms of actual dollars since 1932, it amazes me that we have a motion here saying at one time, “Don’t spend,” and then at the other time, “Don’t offload those programs.” If we are not going to be able to spend the money, if we are not going to support the municipalities, then of course the programs are going to be offloaded to them. So I think it would have been beneficial if some more thought had been given to how this motion was worded.

I want to talk about a few other issues. I want to talk about the deficit in general. We just heard the member for Oakville South talking about the deficit. He cited a column from Jeffrey Simpson, who is a very respectable member

of the media, which talked about the federal deficit. He is quite right; we all should be concerned about the federal deficit. But the provincial deficit is nowhere near what the federal deficit is. The member for Scarborough-Agincourt points out on many occasions in committee about our debt servicing ratio being far lower than that of the federal government. I believe he commented that it was 10% at the time of the election. I believe the federal was around 34%. So we have some capacity.

That does not mean it is unlimited, and we have to try to find new ways of creating revenue. But how we create that revenue should be the real concern, and the fact that our revenue has decreased. Why has that revenue decreased? Because of our economic ability to produce the revenue. The fact is that we are in very difficult economic times. As was cited earlier, I believe by the member for St Catharines, about the number of permanent job losses, this time, compared to the last recession, there is 50% permanent job loss versus 20%. That has a very dramatic impact on the constituents in the riding of Oxford and I think in every member’s riding; the layoffs. We have to try to deal with that and we have to try to help those people through this very difficult time. That does take money. That does take resources.

It is interesting, too. One of the other issues talked about costs, and I have heard some of the opposition members talk about the degree of accountability. There is no doubt that many people—I would say the vast majority of Ontarians—are concerned about accountability in government. It is a difficult problem with any large organization, how you develop a degree of accountability.

1640

We look at the area that takes up the most amount of cost, the health care system, and we have certainly heard in the past about people’s concerns about accountability. Yet, I would suggest, when the third party was the government, it had ample opportunity to try and bring a management system into health care. We did not see that. The past government attempted and in some ways made some progress, but it was not the most successful.

I also want to come back to the other issue of economic viability.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): There are a lot of private conversations going on, a lot of heckling and that is out of order. The honourable member for Oxford has the floor. Please give him the respect of listening to him.

Mr Sutherland: Let us talk again about how we are going to create wealth in the future. Well, there are several ways we can do that. We could raise more taxes, but with the economic situation, the Treasurer has already indicated that he is not interested in raising taxes a great deal, and that is fair enough, so what we have really got to look at is how we generate the wealth. How do we generate the wealth to stimulate the economy, so that we can bring in extra revenue without raising taxes?

The way of doing that is through several means. One, I think this province has not invested enough money in research and development issues to keep us competitive in

the global economy. We hear a lot about the global economy and how we have to be competitive. The third party takes a rather, what I consider, simplistic view about it. They say you cut taxes and the economy is just going to take off. That is not the reality. We live in a very competitive world, and we have to have the technology, the resources, the human resources.

I want to come back to the issue again, as the member for Cochrane South mentioned, about funding for post-secondary education. If you go and look where funding for post-secondary education started to drop off—1977—who was the government in 1977? Since that time the amount as a percentage of the provincial budget has declined.

If they were really concerned about generating wealth in the future economy, they would have been investing in the people, because if you look at the successful economies, they invest in the people. They resource in brain power and in the power of their people and their citizens. That is where we will be able to generate the wealth, because if we have very effective post-secondary education we develop the people with the ideas and they take those ideas and bring them to fruition and create jobs and keep the economy moving forward on a regular basis.

I want to talk about a few other concerns related to this motion and related to the economy as a whole. In the motion it talks about the issue of loss of jobs and loss of economic opportunity. Again, that comes back to the issue of investment. Now, we have heard people talk about investment in the infrastructure, but again, I want to state that in those successful economies where it has occurred, it has not just been in the infrastructure; it has also been in the people.

I think the other thing that we suffer from in this province has been a sense of confrontation. If you look at other successful economies, if you look at Sweden, if you look at West Germany, the main groups involved in their economic success have worked together. You have had business, labour and the government, all three of them, come together to work together for the benefit of their country and the benefit of their citizens.

In this province the history has not been that way. It has been a history of confrontation between labour and business and, in many cases, a lack of recognition of the contribution that labour makes, the fact that people who are working on shop floors have ideas on how they can be more efficient, how the business can run more efficiently, how you can produce better products. I really think that we need to develop the spirit of co-operation, that all parties have a vested interest in the health of this province, and that we can no longer afford a confrontational attitude because we are not competing against each other in this province; we are competing against the rest of the people in the world.

Finally, just to sum up a bit here and to talk about the motion one more time, as I say, the government cannot have it both ways. If it wants to hold the line on taxes and freeze the deficit and not increase it whatsoever, it cannot also deal with the problem of the downloading that has occurred over the last many years. There is just no way it is going to be able to do that and to meet the real needs of

people out there, the single parents in my riding who do not have adequate day care so they cannot get off the social assistance program. They want to work, but there is not adequate day care for them, and other needs like that. The farmers of Oxford, who have been the backbone of my community for hundreds of years and still continue to be and who suffer due to high interest rates, have many needs.

I am going to leave it at that and let my other colleagues participate in this debate, but again I want to re-emphasize the fact that we must be investing in people and we must develop a very co-operative spirit so that we can generate the revenue to fund the programs without having to raise taxes significantly.

Mrs McLeod: It seems almost self-evident in approaching this particular debate to recognize that the most fundamental challenge that faces this government as it approaches its first budget is the challenge of trying to determine how it is possible to fund the absolutely acute growing needs in social program areas at a time when we are in fact in recession, when the economy is in decline and when further taxation really is intolerable because of people's and businesses' inability to pay.

It is ironic that this challenge becomes even greater in this period of recession because, as the recession deepens, the needs in social program areas get greater and the costs necessarily become greater. Therefore, the question really has to be addressed, who can most appropriately pay these increased costs for needed, essential, mandatory social programs? That raises a question for me, one of the fundamental aspects of this challenge that has to be addressed, and that is referred to in this resolution as municipal offloading, the question of what municipalities can reasonably afford to pay as their share of the costs of social programs. That is the issue I would particularly like to spend a few minutes addressing today.

I think we know well, the members of this House, that the numbers of people on welfare are increasing at a rapid rate and that the municipalities bear 20% of the increased costs of social assistance. That is, of course, unless the numbers of people on social assistance exceed 4% of the population of that particular community, in which case they only have to assume 10% of the costs, and we can only hope that is not a situation that communities across Ontario might find themselves facing in this particular year.

But we have repeatedly asked in the House, as we have brought forward the facts of increased numbers of people on social assistance, what kind of response the government can make to the individuals who are unemployed certainly, but also to those municipalities and to the municipal rate-payers who are having to bear a truly significant portion of this increased cost.

I think it is probably worth repeating some of the facts that we have introduced in questions in the House, because those facts really do represent the reality of increasing unemployment and the increased costs of social assistance, when we see that in the year from January 1990 to January 1991 the numbers of people on social assistance have increased in Dufferin-Peel by 120%, in Hamilton-Wentworth

by 56%, in Peel by 90%, in Timmins by 78%, and the reality of these figures just goes on and on.

One of the other real concerns is that, in addition to the share of the costs that is borne by the municipal ratepayer, the municipalities are experiencing such a significant financial stress in managing their budgets that they have very little flexibility in administering social assistance programs, so that we are finding—I am sure each one of us, in our constituency offices—situations where special assistance programs and supplementary aid programs are just not being made available to people in spite of the very real needs that are presented. That is a problem that the municipalities are struggling with because they have very little discretion when their share of the mandatory social program costs is getting greater and greater.

1650

There are other programs, quite clearly, that the municipalities have to share the costs of that are not seen to be mandatory, that are not an automatic increase in the budget for that municipality but nevertheless we would all agree are essential costs. I think particularly of the need for child care.

Here again the need is great, and it is not just a need for spaces; it really is a need for subsidized spaces. We know that the government introduced 5,000 new subsidies and made those subsidies available to municipalities, to begin to respond to that need for subsidized child care spaces. It was regrettable perhaps that the subsidies came at a time when, for many municipalities, it was too late to include their share of the costs in their particular budgets. I think it is an even greater concern that we have municipalities questioning whether they can even afford to accept a greater number of subsidized spaces because they just cannot manage their 20% share of the increased subsidies that have been made available to them.

We become extremely concerned when we hear about Metropolitan Toronto talking about having to raise the fees for parents who are availing themselves of child care because the real costs of child care are not being borne by the existing grant system. We were pleased to hear this morning that the Minister of Community and Social Services has now instituted a joint review of the real costs of providing child care in Metro and that hopefully some of those real costs will be addressed so that the cost to the municipalities can be lessened.

Some of the areas that are seen to be discretionary for municipalities surely must be recognized as mandatory. If we look at homemaker services, if we look at the municipal share in the cost of homes for the aged, if we look at the need for transitional houses for battered women, surely all these are not automatic, mandatory cost increases for municipalities or for the provincial government. We recognize them as being essential services that must be provided even in these very difficult times.

I think we have to recognize too that as municipalities face increased budget costs for social programs, that has a really significant impact on their ability to provide other services that are clearly the municipalities' jurisdiction, the cost of transportation and police and fire protection.

Obviously the question we come to is, who should be responsible for meeting the needs in social program areas and what is the most appropriate base of support? I think there would be unanimous agreement among all members of this House that the property tax base is not the most appropriate base for meeting the needs in social program areas. It may well be the most appropriate base for funding municipal services directly to property owners, but it is not a way that municipalities can deal with the increased cost of social programs, particularly when these costs are escalating at such a significant rate.

Members of the House may be aware of a study that was undertaken in order to address this issue of the provincial-municipal share of social programs. It was by the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Committee. The difficulty with that particular study, which I would certainly be prepared to acknowledge, is that it looked only at the funding for social programs, when in fact what needs to be looked at is the whole area of municipal-provincial funding.

Nevertheless—and I recognize that the government has referred this matter, along with a number of other taxation measures, to the new tax commission—I have to confess that while I think these issues do need to be examined, we do need certainly to look at the area of provincial-municipal cost-sharing in its full complexity, not just in the social services area. I am very concerned about whether or not it is possible for this particular tax commission to examine all the issues that have been referred to it and report on new approaches within my lifetime as a legislator.

These issues are complex. Many of them have been studied repeatedly. There have been a number of studies already addressed to the government that recommend that the province take a greater share of the social service costs, particularly in the areas where 100% is recommended for social assistance by three different reports, and the particular report on provincial-municipal social services also recommended that the province should assume 100% of funding of child welfare costs.

I would recognize the kind of pressures which the government faces as it approaches this particular budget, and I would recognize that current revenues are down, as other members have identified, and the scope for increasing revenues from new taxation is just not there when we are in a recession-battered and a GST-hit period. We know that the only real source of new revenue is economic growth and economic stability and job creation, and of course the benefit to that is that as the economy grows, as jobs are created, social assistance costs go down, health care costs go down, child welfare costs go down, so there are new dollars for social programs. For this to occur, there has to be economic stability and growth.

We can only hope that the government's priority as it approaches this fundamental question in this first budget is that we will see a program for economic recovery in Ontario so that we can have some optimism that the question of social program needs can be addressed even as we are able to provide the economic base for those social programs.

Mr Tilson: We have heard a great deal during the last election and even since then, particularly from the NDP

Agenda for People, that Ontario should lead a tax revolt. We have heard over and over that Ontario is going to lead a tax revolt. My question is, where is this revolt? Is it in some of the policies that the government is coming out with? Is it in this tax commission that has been sent off somewhere? I do not know where it is or what it is doing, but is it in the tax commission?

There is no question in my mind that one of the greatest concerns that is going around this province, not only during the election—and I am sure the government members found the same thing—is the issue of downloading. They talked about it. We talked about it. We criticized the former Liberal government for it, and I really have not seen much change.

The recent unconditional grant announcement by this government, I submit, is totally unsatisfactory. This announcement gives no real commitment to end once and for all the issue that they promised, and that is the subject of the downloading: the downloading of programs, the downloading of costs, the downloading of responsibilities, and of course without commensurate funding to municipalities and school boards.

People in my riding and, I am sure, all around this province are continually raising the issue of their tax revolt. This government is not having a tax revolt, so they are starting their own tax revolt. I simply ask, when is this government going to announce a clear policy statement with respect to this subject to prove that it is different from the last government?

We have seen spiralling welfare costs, which have been referred to by other speakers, that have been passed off to county and regional governments. Municipalities and school boards are now cutting back on their programs. They have to cut back on their programs, on their taxes, simply to survive.

One example is the chairman of the regional municipality of Peel, who wrote the Premier on 16 October to express his strong objection to the impact of funding arrangements under the General Welfare Assistance Act. That subject has gone completely silent. Mr Bean wrote the Premier, saying: "I know from our recent meeting that you are aware of the impact the funding arrangements under the General Welfare Assistance Act are having on the municipal tax base. In Peel, net expenditures for this program in 1990 are expected to be 85.7% over those in 1989. The property taxpayer in Peel will contribute over \$5,200,000 to the cost of providing assistance this year as compared to \$2,800,000 in 1989."

Now, that is an unbelievable increase, and this government does not appear to be doing anything about that.

Mr Bean continued by saying: "Both the report of the Social Assistance Review Committee and the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Committee report recommend removal of the property tax base from the funding formula for welfare payments. Expenditures in this program are closely limited to factors that are beyond local control, such as economic and unemployment trends and federal and provincial policy directions, and therefore must not be tied to such a limited tax source."

Mr Bean pleaded with the Premier. He stated that he is therefore requesting that the Premier "move quickly to remove the requirement of municipal contribution to the cost of assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act, recognizing the adjustments as needed in the provincial-municipal social services report may need to be considered at a later stage." He clearly is expressing and has put this government on notice of a very serious concern that he has and that this government does not intend to be dealing with it.

There are a number of issues that are continuing on with respect to the issue of downloading that our party and the New Democratic Party debated during the last election, and the second issue is the escalating cost of court security. There have been requests made to the government and requests made through my office to deal with this subject to stop this type of practice. In fact, the Peel regional board of police commissioners last November passed a resolution specifically requesting that subject, that whole policy of downloading of costs be stopped. Specifically, it had to do with the resolution that was passed on 21 November 1990 which referred to the fact that the Ontario Provincial Police had indicated that the Ontario Provincial Police would be no longer carrying out investigations into family benefit frauds in Peel and other jurisdictions. That is another subject that has been passed on to the local municipalities. They felt that this would, no question, result in assumption of significant backlogs—and there are backlogs in that whole subject—resulting in an increase of workload for the Peel Regional Police, which will result in more administrative costs and the hiring of more staff to service this need.

1700

So the province of Ontario, through Bill 187, which the past government passed; the freedom-of-information legislation, which was Bill 107, the Police Services Act; and other initiatives continued to download costs to both municipal forces and municipalities in general.

I hope that the Treasurer in his budget that is coming up next week deals with this subject and makes clear his policy as to a change in the downloading policy of this government.

Mr Ferguson: I am pleased to join in this debate today because I think it talks about issues of concern not only to the paying public but to various levels of government, of course ours included.

Having had the opportunity, 12 years previous, to sit on council at the local level, I want to say that I cannot count the number of times that downloading has occurred. We call it the "bump and grind" effect at the local level, where the province would bump a program over to the municipality and we would have to grind in order to find the dollars to fund the program. Of course, there are some good reasons for that happening and there are some not-so-good reasons for that happening.

One of the good reasons was that the province at the time was trying to exercise some sort of leverage in order to accomplish its goals and objectives in having municipalities buy into a particular program. However, I think as

a government we have attempted to talk to municipalities, we have attempted to get the views of municipalities, to tap their thoughts, their ideas, their suggestions and tried to work in a partnership so that we can achieve a common goal, and that is service to the public and that is service to various communities throughout Ontario. One example of that is the Ballinger-Hopcroft report, which talks about the municipal-provincial funding relationship and the course that that should take in the future.

I think we have very much become entrapped in a mindset. I remember growing up in the 1960s. At that time it was the "we" generation. Everybody seemed to express a concern for everybody else. Well, let me say the 1990s have come full circle: It is no longer the "we" generation; it is the "me" generation. I think we have to look at some sort of major attitude adjustment. The prevalent thought in this place seems to be that if you do something for me and I benefit directly, then that is social progress and you are doing good things; but if the government does something for somebody else, well, it is no longer social progress—my goodness, that is socialism. I think it is time for a major attitude adjustment on behalf of a lot of individuals in this place.

The priority of this government is not to throw good money after bad. The priority of this government is to assist those who, in the midst of this recession, need help the most, and we are going to do that. Not because we took an opinion poll and it told us that the public was on side; in fact, we are going to do that because it is right, it is just and I think we recognize it is the fair thing to do.

So on the surface this resolution looks extremely sound. It has a nice ring to it. It is politically popular. It has a politically popular message. It says, "Hold the line on taxes." It says, "Give the municipalities a break." It says, "Balance the budget in three years and, for goodness' sake, do all those things and at the same time retire the debt." I want to say that is an admirable goal. It is an admirable goal, but I think what we fail to recognize is that we are going to try to attempt to do all those things, or we are being told, "Do all these things," without taking into account what is happening in the real world and how the economic slowdown that we are experiencing today is affecting everybody. It is clearly not taking into account what is happening in the real world.

In the upcoming budget we are going to be very clear. We are going to be very clear about what we can pay for today and we are going to be very clear about what we can afford to pay for tomorrow. We are going to be very clear that we are going to help those who need assistance the most and that our decision to spend for the future will be done in order to assist those individuals who need help the most.

I want to tell members that is not a revolutionary thought. People make those kinds of decisions every day in their household. They decide what they can afford today and what they can afford to finance for the future. That is exactly the decision that we are going to make.

We could go down two roads. We did not have the luxury of sitting around for a couple of months while the economy picked up steam. Immediately on 7 September

we were faced with a decision to make. We were at the fork in the road. We could either go down the road that said, "Spend, spend, spend," which I think would be most irresponsible, without any regard to the deficit; or we could have gone down the other road, which I think is the wrong road to go down, which would have been, "Cut, cut, cut." Clearly that is the wrong road to go down, because when you take that path you hurt those who need help the most in today's economy.

Let me just wrap up by saying that anyone—and I want to tell members, anyone—can captain the ship of state on calm seas, anyone. All you have to do is stand there, like my friends opposite did, and cruise and wave, just cruise and wave. That is all you have to do as the ship goes merrily along. Well, the seas today are not calm. I want to tell members that this government is going to do whatever it has to do in order to ensure that once the hurricane is over we have some survivors on board. We want some survivors on board.

Mr Elston: Hurricane Floyd.

Mr Ferguson: In conclusion, let me say that we are under some very, very trying circumstances. We are going to do the very best we possibly can. We are going to be financially responsible and we are going to do the best we can in what is an extremely difficult situation.

Mr Curling: What an honour it is for me to speak in the House today on this motion. I want to say at the start that I have full confidence in this Treasurer to understand the issues. I have worked with this Treasurer in the past on many committees, and he seems to listen. As a matter of fact his colleague has just named him Hurricane Floyd, and he seems to be the only one who may survive after the examination of this government.

I have concerns, though, about his colleagues, because he needs the support in order to put forward a very aggressive and good budget, a budget that, as members know, comes at a time of recession.

It comes at a time when we have massive layoffs. It comes at a time when we have many people whose dreams are shattered, many young people who are looking forward to going to university and finding out that they may not do so, many people who have even acquired some of their dreams, the dream of owning a home, and today they are losing it each day as they call my office, or my home.

As recently as last night, when I got home at 11:30 there was somebody in my home who told me that within a week the sheriff would be coming to lock them out because they have earned all these years to acquire this home of theirs, and because of a layoff and this recession, it is not theirs any more.

1710

The government actually in its short time has demonstrated that it has no plans, and I would say I am only judging it from the fact that when it introduced Bill 4, the reason for that—I do not want to rehash the whole issue, but, again, I thought they would have some sort of strategy, some plan, some organization to it all. It lacked consultation. It lacked any kind of way of understanding the issue, and I am more disappointed than anyone else here

because of that lack of planning and lack of strategy on behalf of the government.

The Treasurer's budget must be able to protect the most vulnerable people today in our society, because most of the time when there is a recession, or all the time there is a recession, there are those people who are last hired and the first to be laid off or to be fired. They are women, the visible minorities or native people, and many times when I hear this government speak, it is like it has just discovered people. They talk about it as, "We are anointed by God to understand people and the Tories and the Liberals don't understand people," and furthermore that the private sector is not people and everything should be done by government. Therefore, when they start to do any consultation, they lock other people out and feel, "We will have the answer to all the problems we have."

I would like to warn them that to represent people is to represent all people. We have one of the most resilient resources in this province. We have people from all parts of the world. All parts are coming here giving their service and giving their skills.

I have yet to see this government put forward any plan of training to utilize and to enhance the resources of these people. They speak about putting it in the hands of the private sector and the private sector should do the training on this. We were talking about offloading. We cannot offload our responsibilities of government to believe that the private sector is to carry through this. We have got to make sure that the government—not the unions to do the training, and not only the private sector to do the training, but all of us, to work hand in hand—

Mr Elston: In partnership.

Mr Curling: —private and public sector. Of course, as my colleague said, in partnership, in order to utilize our best resources here, not to come here, as I said, being anointed, "We understand the ordinary people and we understand the little man or the little woman," because each contribution, the private sector or whether the public sector, has that contribution to make.

The people are hurting. We want, around this budget that is being presented, that we understand the issue, that we do some consultation, not that make-believe stuff where we call a couple of our friends in the unions on the phone and say, "I've spoken to you, and if you are called by any members, tell them that you've spoken to these members."

We saw where the Police Services Act regulation was done in that kind of manner. I asked many of the people who had vested interests. All the people of Ontario have a vested interest in how the police behave and how justice is being done in this province. But the way we are seeing this, we are being called by a few interest groups and then told, "Here is the regulation."

I know they all are quite literate people, and as my colleague here would say to them, "Read the Hansard for some of the things that you have said in the past," because some of the things they have said in the past, if they go by it in detail, they would not go astray. As I always say, not only should they just talk about talk but do some action. If

they walk the same walk that they have talked, I tell them they cannot go wrong.

In the meantime, there is the suffering of the people in the province, the suffering of the people in my constituency of Scarborough North, who have seen a tremendous amount of layoffs. The fact is that they need jobs, they need to be productive, they need to contribute, and this government, which has put itself up as understanding it all, does not seem to know what it is doing. Surprisingly enough, I think they have a good heart, but I think their will and their attitude have shown otherwise. Having just a good heart and giving these nice words in this House, or even outside or in news releases, does not help the situation.

We want money where we can put it into action. The people need that. They need jobs. They do not need to have \$700 million recycled over and over and respend and reannounced and reannounced.

I must give credit to this government in some respects. Not all that they have done is bad. I have listened here in the short time and heard them reintroduce many Liberal policies, and I commend them for doing that. I commend them for recognizing good policies and following through on that. The Police Services Act is a good example. I say to them that that tells me there is intellect over there. Maybe it needs us to be more aggressive on the opposition side so that they can follow the rules and recognize the people who need to contribute.

Hon Mr Wildman: Substance.

Mr Curling: The honourable member, the Minister of Natural Resources, said he wants substance. Do members see what I have said? He cannot recognize it when he sees what there is to be done.

I say to the members in my summary that I still have confidence in this Treasurer, because I have worked with him, and I ask his backbenchers as they are hooting in the back there at times to listen to the constructive criticism that comes from here. Listen to the fact of people who understand the people too. They are not the only ones who understand people. As a matter of fact, I question if they do understand the people to that extent. Rhetoric will not get us anywhere; action will.

Mr Cousens: I would like to congratulate the leader of our party for presenting this motion and giving us an opportunity to remind the government of its responsibilities to the people of Ontario. We are doing it in time, because they still have an opportunity to consider what they are going to put in the budget. In fact, I commend the Treasurer for being here today. We will be listening to him on Monday. Let's hope he is listening to us today.

First of all, I would remind him not to listen too much to the Liberals, because they had a chance to do things right and they are the ones who began this whole process of offloading expensive items to the municipalities, just huge numbers of them, requiring the municipalities to increase their taxes to double-digit levels, making it next to impossible for people in our ridings to continue to afford to live in their own homes, in their own condos. So there is a precedent that I do not want this government to follow. Do not listen to what the Liberals are doing. The NDP

should come along and at least remind themselves of what they said when they were in opposition and know for a fact that there are a number of things that they should be really considering carefully.

On the environmental subject, and as the Environment critic for our caucus, I am genuinely concerned with what is going to happen to Metro's waste reserve fund, this accumulated money that has come out of the tipping fees, which is now about to be dipped into in order to pay some of the high welfare bills of the municipality. Metro Toronto has a huge problem in trying to keep its budget under control. There is a little pot of money there. Then this minister is coming along and saying, "Well, maybe we'll have a shared program to handle the garbage in the province," and then Metro is looking at other ways of doing it. I really hope that there is some way in which we can start balancing budgets, balancing responsibility, accepting the accountability at different levels of the province for what they are responsible for.

I would like to remind the Treasurer as well that the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement guidelines are really causing a large cost to the local municipalities. There has never been any understanding at the provincial level on what it costs to implement MISA. I was at a large seminar that was being held in Metro Toronto this week. Across Ontario, representatives have gathered from the tricommittee and from—I was one of the keynote speakers yesterday morning and brought up what is happening in Los Angeles. In the United States some 800,000 miles of sewer are disintegrating. It is like an Alka Seltzer tablet in water the way it is eating away at the concrete, because once they removed all the heavy effluents in the sewer system, all the heavy metals, the bacteria are gathering there now and it is now eroding in a huge way the sewers. So there is going to be a large replacement cost that is also going to be impacting the costs of our sewers and the infrastructure in our own province.

1720

Members should understand that for every action this government takes at the provincial level, it has an impact at the local level, and that the taxpayers cannot afford to pay any more. The government should not think it is doing them a favour to have an increased deficit. This government somehow has to balance the needs of the province with the ability of people in this province to pay for it.

My question is, who is going to be paying for Metropolitan Toronto's garbage when the Minister of the Environment has announced that York region is going to be the place where this government is going to be depositing Metro's garbage? And that is lunacy. First of all, I question the logic, I question the policy, but now I ask who is going to pay for it. Who is going to pay for it? I certainly hope this government is not passing that down to the people at the local level.

When this government comes off with its environmental bill of rights, that too is going to be another instance in which the public ends up having to pay for its policies. I trust that this will be a budget that is balanced and that does not pass on more responsibility to the local taxpayer.

Mr Mahoney: It is a surprise to know that the Treasurer is going to give us his wisdom for almost 20 minutes. That will be fascinating. We will take notes. Well, there are 17 left on the clock.

I am pleased to rise to discuss this and I am very interested in some of the comments that have been made by some of my colleagues in this House. The issue that the Conservatives are the purveyors of truth and the only ones who are responsible for balanced budgets and that the socialists are going to take care of all of the social problems, frankly, that makes me laugh a little bit when I hear some of the nonsense.

Members should know that when we came into government, we inherited a real deficit of \$2.6 billion—the Liberal Party did. It was not manufactured. It was not created based on new programs or Liberal policies. Unlike this government's, it was not something we manufactured, but it was in fact a real deficit.

When the current Treasurer took office, he held a press conference and the very first question he was asked by the media was, "Did the Liberals lie?" in trying to discuss the \$2.5-billion deficit that he was announcing. To his credit, he said, "No, the Liberals did not lie, the Treasurer did not lie." I believe he went on to explain how the deficit occurred, how we went from a balanced budget to a \$2.5-billion deficit. I think the Treasurer will recall there was \$700 million in lost revenue, due to the downturn in the economy, from retail sales tax alone. Anybody in the retail business would understand the impact that lost revenue had.

There was another \$300 million in lost revenue due to the slowdown in the housing industry and the fact that our land transfer tax revenues were depleted by some \$300 million. We were at \$1 billion before they opened the books. That was not manufactured or cooked or made up. That was reality.

Then I think the Treasurer sat down and looked at it and said: "Well, let's see. We've got a UTDC loan here of \$400 million which was instituted by our colleagues over here."

Hon Mr Laughren: It was due.

Mr Mahoney: It was not even due. It was a wonderful opportunity to pay off the mortgage even though the mortgage was not due and maybe blame the former government. But in all fairness, the Treasurer was honourable; he admitted that. He admitted that \$400 million was indeed paying off the debt that was not currently due. So we are up to \$1.4 billion.

Then there was the slush fund, and the Treasurer admitted that the policies of the NDP, since it took government, would add a \$700-million deficit. Now we are up to \$2.1 billion.

Hon Mr Laughren: That's silly.

Mr Mahoney: That is silly? Those are the numbers the Treasurer put forward and they are the facts, to the honourable minister.

An hon member: No.

Mr Mahoney: Yes, they are.

Then there was another \$0.3 billion. We are up to \$2.4 billion, all created either by the policies of this Treasurer and his left-wing government or by the downturn in the economy. They were not created, unlike when we took office and we inherited from the owners of Minaki Lodge, who only bought Minaki Lodge so they could fly in their water bombers and go on vacation up there, so we promptly sold the lodge to save the taxpayers the problem. We inherited that and of course fear of—I mean, unbelievable.

Can members imagine a Conservative government, which is now calling for fiscal responsibility, which bought Suncor? I mean, going into the national gasoline business. Fascinating, a really difficult position to understand, but in any event they had Suncor on the books, they had Minaki Lodge, they had deficits that Mr Davis—and we heard about McKeough earlier—had left the people of this province. We as a Liberal government inherited that and for the first time in 20 years balanced the books, for the first time in 20 years balanced the budget, so we understand what this motion means.

I personally support it because I think it is very important to send a message of confidence to the people, to the business community and to the labour community in this province. Let me tell members that is not the message that is going out there. As a matter of fact, I believe, and it is very obvious to me as I talk to people around the province—like my colleague the member for Nipissing I am getting around a little bit too, perhaps not quite as aggressively as he and others, but I am getting around a little bit just to spread the message.

I am hearing a real sense of fear. There is an atmosphere of fear out there. People are saying, "My goodness, have we really got four more years of this?" I say: "Actually, probably not. We may have five more years of this, four and half, somewhere around there." People are frightened. They go: "We didn't really vote for this. I mean, we thought maybe we were going to get a minority Liberal government. We were a little angry with Mulroney, we were a little fed up with some of the Peterson policies, but we didn't really vote for a socialist Ontario, we really didn't." The people are saying that and they are getting up and they are going—

Interjection.

Mr Mahoney: To the member for Oxford, honestly, it is true. He knows he got here by accident. He should admit it. Give me a break. The member was walking between classes when somebody called him and said he had won. It was the biggest shock. He had to leave the beer hall, for God's sake, to go and get sworn in. The member should admit it.

It was a shock, 6 September, and here we are. It was such a surprise that some members had even ordered a whole other year's supply of letterhead from their other job. Tell me that the member actually believed he would be here. Why would he have ordered the letterhead and the business cards? I understand that one member had his furniture in a van. He was going to Florida and he said, "Honey, don't worry, they just want me to put my name up." Our friend the member for Durham East said: "They

just want me to put my name up. I won't win. No problem." They were moving to Florida. Guess what? He had to unpack the van. The member for Durham East is going: "Back the van up, dear, we got to unpack it. We won."

Let's face it, it really was not intentional. The Treasurer won on purpose. He is an old pro. He has been doing this for a long time. But it really was not intentional to get a majority socialist government and we had better understand that, because now what is happening is that the public out there is saying: "My God, we're going to have a welfare state that will be out of control. We're going to have deficits in the \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion, \$6 billion—

Interjection.

Mr Mahoney: I do not know. How high can the member count? Is there any responsibility? Is there any accountability? Understand something. It is fine to say, "No more taxes," and I understand that they have to deliver services, but the Treasurer had better realize something, and I think he does even though he might not like to admit it because he wants to forget the old days when he wanted to nationalize Inco. That was then; this is now. He really did not mean that. He had better understand that we need places like Inco to be healthy, to be productive, to be creating jobs, to be paying taxes, to be generating wealth in this community. Under a socialist government, they are scared to death. They do not know what the Treasurer is going to do. I suggest there is a reason for that. The reason they do not know what the Treasurer is going to do is because he does not know what he is going to do.

1730

Mr Runciman: Those were interesting comments by the member for Mississauga West. He was trying to emphasize the point that the NDP is in government by accident. That may well be the case, but I want to remind him that the Liberals were in government by reason of going to bed with the socialists. We can say that we are faced with a socialist government in this province because of the actions of the Liberal government, not only in essence by going to bed with them—

Mr Mahoney: You looked under the sheets too.

Mr Runciman: —but the fact that it ran the province so badly during the five-year opportunity it had that we are now the highest-taxed jurisdiction in North America.

Mr Perruzza: Listen up, Mahoney.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Downsview, I would ask you to refrain from heckling.

Mr Runciman: I did not even hear him, so obviously he was not having much impact.

I want to talk briefly about this, and I have a great deal of respect for the Treasurer. He is a fine gentleman. He knows something is coming here.

I think it was interesting when they talked about releasing our facts on our own personal incomes and our own personal status and it was revealed that the Treasurer does not have any Canada savings bonds, does not have any guaranteed income certificates, does not have any investments

whatsoever. I want to ask him today, does he have a bank account?

Hon Mr Laughren: What you see is what you get.

Mr Runciman: We are talking about a man responsible for a \$50-billion-plus budget in this province. I know he is a competent individual, but I want to look at that government totally.

We talk about great concerns on the part of people in this province about what is happening. We have seen the virtual collapse in the past few days of one minister. We saw the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs go down the tubes; we are now seeing the Solicitor General quite possibly being faced with resignation. A lot of these problems stem from the fact that we do not have anyone in that government with any business experience. They do not know how to deal with a balance sheet. We have staff who have no real experience. We are drawing from union ranks; we are not drawing from people with business experience, we are not drawing from people who can really help them to manage a competent government in this province. I think that is creating a great deal of concern among a significant number of people in this province.

The bureaucracy is referring to this government as the Clampetts. We all recall that old TV show, the Beverly Hillbillies—I think it is dead on.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have the responsibility to make sure that the procedures are followed. If I cannot hear, I cannot help. So I would ask you to refrain from heckling. It is in the procedures, section 20(b).

Mr Runciman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate your intervention.

I want to say that the socialist takeover of a province is a signal for economic disaster. We just have to look at what happened in British Columbia, what happened in Saskatchewan, what happened in Manitoba, and what is now happening in the province of Ontario: an unprecedented number of bankruptcies, people being laid off on a significant daily basis. It is a scary prospect that we are all facing.

Mr Pouliot: What is a socialist to you, Bob? Tell us what a socialist is.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no point in going on like this. There is no point at all, honestly.

Le député de Lac-Nipigon, je vous demande de vous modérer.

Mr Runciman: The unfairness of this is that I have limited time and they have chewed into it significantly. Maybe it pays off to heckle. I am not sure. I will try it again myself some time.

I want to say, in wrapping up, that things are happening in this province that many people are not aware of, things like the changes at the Workers' Compensation Board where we are having that packed with people from labour backgrounds. It is going to have a significant, one-sided impact. What do we have? Billions and billions of dollars of unfunded liability. What is the incentive for business to continue to operate in this province, for new investment in

this province? The government is scaring them out of this place. We are faced with very difficult times ahead. We can only hope that this government collapses quickly, we have an election, and a Progressive Conservative government comes to power.

Mrs Marland: I wish it were not necessary to have this motion today. However, in speaking to it, I have a great deal of concern. The fact that already Ontario is the most heavily taxed jurisdiction in North America is something that everyone is concerned about. Our high rates of both personal and business taxation reduce our competitiveness and are contributing to the exodus of businesses out of Ontario to other provinces and to the United States.

Further tax increases, although they will help pay for government programs, will prolong the recession and delay economic recovery. Therefore, government must accept that it cannot be everything to everyone, that it can only collect so much in taxes and only offer so many programs. We must learn to manage revenues more efficiently. If we need more money for essential services like health care and housing, we must decide what else can be reduced in order to free up money for the essentials.

The government must also put its own house in order. That means restraint in wage negotiations and a freeze on any expansion of the public service. One of the worst habits of the previous Liberal government was to announce new programs and then to expect the municipalities and their property taxpayers to pay for them.

For example, in 1990, the Peel Board of Education had to budget over \$13 million for provincially mandated programs by the Liberal government: \$3.5 million for the employer health tax, \$4 million for pay equity legislation, \$1.32 million for reduced class sizes in grades 1 and 2 and \$4 million for occupational health and safety legislation.

In addition to the expenses of provincial offloading, school boards have had to pick up a greater and greater share of education costs. Provincial cost-sharing with the Peel board declined from 30% in 1985 to 18.1% in 1990 under the previous Liberal government. As a result, last year the Peel Board of Education had to raise education taxes by 17.2%.

This year, Mississauga taxpayers who support the Peel Board of Education are a little more fortunate, since they face an education tax increase of 4.98%. I hope that this NDP government will live up to its promise not to download on to the municipalities and school boards. Municipal ratepayers badly need a chance to recover from the double-digit tax increases that they faced year after year when the provincial Liberals were in power.

The interest alone on the national debt will cost more than \$43 billion next year. That is a very scary figure. The national debt is eating up more and more of the federal government's revenues and making it less and less possible to provide the social programs to which Canadians have grown accustomed. Ontario must not fall into the same trap. We must not mortgage our children's and grandchildren's futures to pay for our present greediness.

The province must follow the same commonsense rules of financial management that we use to make our own family budgets. If we cannot afford to pay cash for

something and if the purchase cannot be financed within strict limits, then we do without it. The NDP government must set a target for a balanced budget and develop a scheme to meet that target. If the province does not demonstrate this fiscal responsibility, we run the risk of losing even more ground in our struggle to be competitive in a rapidly changing international market. For if we lose our triple A credit rating and the respect of the international business community, we will fail to attract and keep the innovators, the entrepreneurs, the leaders and the investors who are crucial to our economic wellbeing. Without a strong economy, we cannot do the other things we value, such as looking after vulnerable and sick persons, providing a world-class education to our children and protecting our environment.

1740

The time is now. I think that everyone in this House has a responsibility to recognize that the public is serious about tax revolt, and it is the decisions that are made in this Legislature that push them further and further against the wall. We hope that the budget next Monday will not push the people of Ontario further and further out of reality and into tremendous difficulty.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Treasurer has the floor.

Hon Mr Laughren: Every now and again there are days that remind me of why I have stayed here 20 years, and this has not been one of those days, I hasten to add.

However, I have enjoyed the debate this afternoon and I think that the leader of the third party, by putting the debate before the House this afternoon, has done us all a service. It allows all of us to talk a little bit about how we think the province should be run. We think that that is an appropriate thing to have brought before the House.

I have particularly enjoyed the comments of all those members who spoke from different sides, and we on this side do take seriously the suggestions that members make, as long as they are positive. It does not mean that we have to agree with them all, but we do take them quite seriously.

I must say, though, that there were some aspects of the motion put forth by the leader of the third party that were a little bit hard to take. I think that for the provincial Tories to be giving us advice on how to manage the economy comes a little bit hard for us to accept. It is not that they do not make the odd good point, but I think they should at least acknowledge the fact that some of our problems, not all of them, but some of our problems in this province have their roots at the federal level. You simply must accept that fact. I would take their comments a lot more seriously if, from time to time, they acknowledged that fact, but they never do. They simply stand in their place and defend the indefensible.

Who would disagree that high interest rates have hurt the province of Ontario and pushed us into a recession? Who would disagree that the value of the Canadian dollar has been a factor in the recession? Who would disagree that the GST has had a dampening effect on the economy in the province? And who, of all things, would disagree

that the free trade agreement has had a detrimental effect on the economy of the province as well?

There is a sentence in the motion by the leader of the third party about, "Given the continual upward pressure on provincial taxes and the continual offloading of programs on municipal governments..." I want to say, if anybody ever wrote the book on offloading on another jurisdiction it is the federal government in Ottawa, not the provincial government in Ontario. That is who wrote the book.

Mrs Cunningham: Wait till next Monday. We can hardly wait. We will see what you do on Monday, won't we?

Hon Mr Laughren: I am glad that the members opposite are looking forward with much anticipation to the budget next Monday and I hope that we will not disappoint them. I hope that we are able to bring forth a budget that treats people—

Mrs Cunningham: Wait till we see the big, billion-dollar deficit. Just watch.

Hon Mr Laughren: —the way we think they should be treated in the province of Ontario.

The Deputy Speaker: Member for London North, please.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am not engaging in rhetoric when I say that the federal Tories wrote the book on offloading. They are the ones who did to us what they did on the established programs. They are the ones who did to us on the Canada assistance plan. They are the ones who did that. They are the ones who, at the middle of the worst recession since the 1930s, cut \$100 million out of the Canadian job strategy program. How do they justify that?

At the same time they were doing that, cutting back on the job strategy, we were putting \$700 million into job creation in the province of Ontario. We are very proud of that. We are very proud of the fact that we have taken on the recession and combated the recession and created jobs, not cut back. That is what we have done in this province.

Mrs Cunningham: Give me a break. Tell me one person that you have trained. Talk about training, one person that you have trained, one union that is helping us with the training program in Ontario, just one.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The member for London North, would you please stop heckling the Treasurer?

Hon Mr Laughren: Let me remind the members opposite what the criteria were, because every now and again in the House someone questions the criteria of the \$700-million program. These are the criteria. First of all the objective: The objective was to immediately create jobs through repair, renovations, and the upgrading of public infrastructure in the province. We think that is terribly important.

These were the criteria set out by the operations committee, chaired by my colleague the Chair of Management Board and now the Minister of Health: There had to be a quick start within six months of receiving approval; it had to be labour-intensive because we wanted to create jobs; they had to be communities with high economic need; and

there had to be some job opportunities for designated groups in society; there had to be strong indications of economic hardship in those communities, and also the level of welfare case load growth in those communities. Those were the criteria. We think that they were the right criteria for establishing the decisions as to which communities would get their share of the anti-recession package.

I want to comment briefly on a comment, because this motion came from the third party, the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party. I cannot help but quote something that the federal Prime Minister said in 1984. What he said was, speaking for his party at the federal level, "Give us 20 years and you will not recognize this country." We can barely recognize this province now because of federal policies. That is exactly what he has done.

I do not want to engage simply in rhetoric; I want to give some specific examples. When the free trade agreement was brought in, Canadians were promised 250,000 new jobs. Instead we have seen 226,000 jobs disappear since the free trade agreement was made. Canadians working in the food and beverage industry were assured that free trade would bring with it 6,400 new jobs. Instead they have seen 30,000 jobs disappear. Canadians were assured that employment in the forestry industry would remain stable under free trade. Instead more than 11,000 jobs have been lost. Canadians were told that there would be 1,600 new jobs in the clothing industry with free trade. Two years later, the industry has lost 26,000 jobs.

We do not need any lessons on offloading or any lessons on how to cope with the recession from the third party. All the lessons we need we are getting from the federal government, and we do not like any of them; none of them. As we bring down a budget next week, we are determined to do so in the best interests of all the citizens of this province. We have consulted widely leading up to the budget. The budget consultations were intensive, and I know that the former Treasurer will remember how intensive they were when he held this position as well.

We have listened all across the province to people's concerns. For those people who do not appreciate the fact, I think—

Mr Runciman: Who did you talk to besides Bob White? Gord Wilson? Dennis McDermott around any more?

Hon Mr Laughren: Yes, well, the member for Leeds-Grenville seems to think that we listen only to those people in the organized labour movement. That is simply not true. We listen to everybody across this province, and this budget was drafted having listened to interest groups all across the province, from all the various sectors, from the business community as well as from the labour movement and as well from non-profit organizations all across the province.

When members opposite speak and give us advice, we listen to them. We take their advice seriously. When people out there across the province give us advice on things that they think we should be doing, we listen very carefully. As a matter of fact, we have been saying since the day we were elected that we intended to consult like no other

government had consulted, to consult more widely and to take into consideration the views of all the people of Ontario, not simply any one narrow interest group but all the people of Ontario.

1750

I know—I trust at least—that on next Monday afternoon and the days that follow members opposite will appreciate the fact that we are not able to satisfy everyone with this budget, not at all, but we are going to do the best we can—

Mr Elston: Hurricane Floyd.

Hon Mr Laughren: Not at all, but we are going to do the best we can. We are not prepared to throw up our hands and say: "The recession is upon us. There is nothing we can do." We are determined to tackle this recession head on, to create jobs when we can, because we think it is in the best interests of all the people of this province.

Mr Harris: I am pleased to be able to sum up this debate today. I thank all members for participating and for paying attention to the viewpoint that we are bringing forward in this particular resolution.

I agree with a couple of things that government members and the Treasurer have said: first of all, that the fiscal situation they inherited was not a healthy situation, that in fact the people of Ontario voted for a change on 6 September, that the type of spending, of lack of accountability, out of sync with every other jurisdiction in Canada and in North America and indeed around the world, was causing us serious competitive problems here in Ontario. The Treasurer may not agree with everything obviously that I say. At least I hope he does not. I will know I am in trouble if he does. However, clearly the people of Ontario were not happy with the fiscal direction that we had received.

The motion talks about offloading on municipalities, and the Treasurer tells us nothing about his government. He points to other governments. The people are tired of the finger-pointing around this province. We are interested here in Ontario in what is going on here.

Hon Mr Laughren: You are not tired of Brian Mulroney, Mike?

Mr Harris: The fact that the Treasurer points the finger at the federal government—I assume both Liberal and Conservative ones over the past period of time—says to me he understands that it is not fair, that it is not right, the principle of he or she who opens his or her mouth should pay. He understands that very well, and listening to his comments today, he should understand that the same principles should apply when we are dealing with a provincial government and the municipalities.

One of the most despicable things that the Liberals did when they were in government was they increased spending an average annual rate in excess of 10% per year, 10% per year for each and every year they were in office. Now all the averages for all the other provinces was 7.2%. The average for the federal program spending was 3.7%. The average annual inflation over the period they were in office was 4.4%, so what they did was they increased spending this amount of money. What did they do for it? They taxed. They taxed and taxed and taxed until we were not

competitive in this province. We have seen the cross-border shopping problem. We have seen the other concerns that are worse in Ontario than in any other province.

The second thing they did was they said, "We can't tax any more, so we'll offload." I remember the charts of the Treasurer of the Liberal Party. He brought forward these charts and said: "Look, we're going to spend this money. We've promised it. We're going to announce it. We are going to see that it is spent." But he gave us these charts that said: "Municipalities have been more fiscally responsible than us and they have more capacity to borrow than we do now, so we're going to make municipalities pay. You go out and borrow for the infrastructure that we are promising." That was one of the worst things.

The people of Ontario voted for a change, so we are in this motion reminding the Treasurer that this offloading to municipalities must stop, that he or she who opens his or her mouth should pay. So if there are any promises to be made in this budget, we are asking him to accept responsibility for them.

The other part of the motion, though, deals with deficit financing, because what we fear is that the government has not learned a lesson from what happened over the past decade, quite frankly, in Ontario; not just the Liberals, this massive increase in spending. We fear the government is going to carry on with increases in spending of double the rate of inflation. We fear also that the government does not have even a sense of intestinal fortitude. Where I do give credit to the current Treasurer—not the Liberal Party, not the Premier, but the Treasurer—is that I believe he said to the Premier: "I'll offload everything I can. I'll do all of that. But we must tax for all your promises." He at least said that.

I believe the government is headed down a path to do something far worse. They will not be accountable in this year for their spending. They will not offload it, although I suspect there will be some of it. What they will do is run up the deficit. They will say, "We'll defer the taxing to another generation," and we fear that not only do they believe that this a responsible way to go, but they do not see the slippery slope that they are heading down.

We understand. We are not happy with the federal fiscal situation. We are not happy that they have no more options. We are saying, if this government heads down the slippery slope that they headed down with Pierre Trudeau and the rest 25 years ago—carried on, yes, by some Conservatives as well—it will take away the options before us.

We are most concerned about that, and we are asking the Treasurer to remember what happened to the federal fiscal situation. Twenty-five years ago, 10 or 11 cents on the dollar went to interest; today it is 36 cents. That is \$45 billion a year not available for the needy, for the handicapped, for the poor, for social programs, to help those who need help. We do not want to see the government head down that slope here in Ontario as well, as we see it going.

The Treasurer talked today about the \$700 million, as if we were opposed to that assistance. We told them we would spend \$700 million as well. We told them how to get it. We said: "Bring in a 2% cap, not zero like Quebec.

Bring in a 2% cap in the public sector, guaranteed, recession-proof jobs, and give that \$750 million to those workers who need help." But no, the government decided to run up the deficit for it. They did not think that was responsible.

We have pointed out example after example of wasted spending. The government cannot throw the amount of money around. They cannot take the provincial budget from \$25 billion to \$50 billion in five years without having a substantial waste in the system. We have pointed many of those out to the government, which has refused to acknowledge them or deal with them in any concrete way.

What have they done to run up this deficit? I want to talk about a program—and the Minister of Labour is here—\$175 million for the wage protection fund: Does he know what he is saying to workers? He is saying: "We give up. We can't find you work. We're going to pay you this money." If the government is going to help workers, why is that money not being spent on training, on retraining, on apprenticeship, on relocation to get jobs? The government has given up on the workers of this province. It has given up on the poor. It has given up on the disadvantaged.

I and my party and the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party are not prepared to give up. We are prepared to say: "We're going to put you back to work. We're going to help you. We've not given up on you. We've not given up on companies." All the government says to companies is: "We're going to tax you while you're leaving. You're going to Buffalo? We're going to kick—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The member for Nipissing, please take your seat.

1807

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes—39

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Cleary, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Henderson, Jordan, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLean, Miclash, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Runciman, Scott, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve.

Nays—64

Abel, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Grier, Haack, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson, G., Winner, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

The House adjourned at 1811.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathyssen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Peter Kormos, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 23 April 1991

Members' statements

Ontario border communities	893
Mr Cleary	
Waste management	893
Mr Cousens	
Backus Conservation Education Centre	893
Mr Jamison	
Public transportation	893
Mr Mancini	
Taxation	894
Mr Stockwell	
Belle River constituency office fire	894
Mr Hayes	
Garbage disposal	894
Mr Sola	
Transportation for the disabled	895
Mrs Marland	
Assistance for Romanian orphans	895
Mr Fletcher	

Statements by the ministry

Ministerial responsibility	895
Mr Farnan	
Property assessment	895
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Ontario student assistance program	896
Mr Allen	
Algoma Steel Corp	896
Mr Pilkey	

Responses

Ministerial responsibility	897
Mr Nixon	
Mr Harris	
Ontario student assistance program	898
Mrs Cunningham	
Property assessment	898
Mr Stockwell	

Oral questions

Ministerial responsibility	899
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Scott	
Mr Harris	
Mr Elston	
Mr Farnan	
Cross-border shopping	904
Mr Dadamo	
Mr Pilkey	
Ministerial responsibility	904
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Harris	
Mr Philip	

Ontario Round Table on Environment
and Economy

Mr Waters	905
Mrs Grier	

Petitions

Unemployment	906
Mr Brown	
Hazardous waste	906
Mrs Sullivan	

First readings

Law Society Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 75	906
Mr Hampton	
Agreed to	906
Fraudulent Debtors Arrest Repeal Act, 1991,	
Bill 76	906
Mr Hampton	
Agreed to	906

Opposition Day

Ontario Economy	907
Mr Harris	907
Mr Christopherson	908
Mr Bradley	909
Mr Stockwell	911
Mr Bisson	912
Mr Ramsay	914
Mr Carr	915
Mr Sutherland	916
Mrs McLeod	917
Mr Tilson	918
Mr Ferguson	919
Mr Curling	920
Mr Cousens	921
Mr Mahoney	922
Mr Runciman	923
Mrs Marland	924
Mr Laughren	925
Negatived	927

Other business

Visitor	895
The Speaker	
Adjournment	927

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	928
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	931

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mardi 23 avril 1991

Première lecture

Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur la Société du barreau	
(membres provisoires), projet de loi 75	906
M. Hampton	
Adoptée	906

Loi de 1991 abrogeant la Loi sur l'arrestation des débiteurs	
en fuite, projet de loi 76	906
M. Hampton	
Adoptée	906

A2 ON
41
003



22 1991

22 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature



Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 24 April 1991

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 24 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 24 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

REPORT OF CHIEF ELECTION OFFICER

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table the report of the chief election officer.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

AGRICULTURE IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr Ramsay: I am glad to be here this afternoon, for sure.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food will be aware of the economic difficulties faced by northern Ontario during this recession. The minister also knows that the development and marketing of agricultural initiatives provides an important opportunity to diversify northern Ontario's economy.

The minister has had in his possession ever since he became minister a consultant's study on a number of northern programs designed to develop agricultural opportunities in the north. The study clearly documents the success of funding for northern agricultural development and the need for continued assistance.

One of the most successful programs under this funding was the northern Ontario marketing assistance program, which was begun in 1987. This program increased the number of farmers' markets in northern Ontario from seven to 22 over the last three years and has raised the revenues from \$100,000 to \$1.5 million. This program has truly helped diversify the northern economy and helped northern Ontario become more self-sufficient in food production.

Most of the northern Ontario programs expired as of 31 March this year. Because of the NDP's lack of commitment, the Sudbury farmers' market and others like it will be further stalled in their attempts to grow. The government is cancelling these programs. To quote the ministry's own consultant's study regarding the northern marketing assistance program, "This program responds to the area of greatest need for development in northern Ontario agriculture;...understanding of the marketing process and developing specific market initiatives."

These are important to the people of the north, and the people of northern Ontario demand this.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Runciman: More than 1,500 residents of Ontario have mailed coupons to the Committee for Fair Action in Insurance Reform, saying they want the Premier to keep his promise to restore the right to sue for innocent accident victims. I ask the page to put those on the Premier's desk.

This overwhelming response to a single newspaper ad shows that the people of Ontario want the right to sue restored. They want the Premier to keep his promise.

Two cabinet ministers have indicated recently that the right to sue will not be restored. Instead, we will see a government-run insurance plan similar to the current Workers' Compensation Board and the right to sue will not be part of that plan.

A number of people have written letters to the FAIR committee to explain why they deserve the fundamental right to sue. For example, Peter Samec of Ridgeway writes, "If Mr Rae backs down from his promise he will be depriving us of our freedom to pursue and fight for something that is rightfully ours in the first place." Mr and Mrs Stephen Parsons of Thornhill write, "You should be able to anticipate the outcome for you and your party if you fail to keep this most important promise."

I have asked the Premier a number of times whether the right to sue will be included in his new insurance plan. He says a decision has not been made. Well, I say a decision has been made. He has capitulated to the whims of his no-tort troika on the front bench and the right to sue will not be restored.

If the Premier does not agree, let him prove me wrong. Let him restore the right to sue.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

Mr Wiseman: I rise today to acknowledge the excellent work done by the Durham Board of Education in the area of environmental awareness. Since this is Earth Week, I think it is appropriate to describe the efforts of the Durham Board of Education in promoting environmental solutions in their schools.

On 12, 13 and 14 April, almost 100 teachers, parents, custodians, trustees and board members attended the second environmental summit at the Leslie Frost Centre, Dorset. The theme of the summit was "Making It Happen". What the theme statement refers to is making all the action plans and initiatives happen in the classroom and in the schools of Durham in order to bring about meaningful and lasting changes in students' attitudes and behaviours.

These initiatives include creating worm composters in the classroom to compost student lunch scraps; recycling fine paper, tins, glass; creating composters for the composting of yard waste and digesters for cafeteria scraps; the promotion of garbageless lunches; the studying of wetland habitat; and the development of ecologically sound purchasing practices for the schools and boards. Another very important, environmentally progressive goal of some of the participants of this conference was the planning of wildlife habitats on school property.

I think that some of these people should be mentioned: Pauline Lang, director of education; Bruce Walker, superintendent; John Briggs, teacher, G. L. Roberts Collegiate and Vocational Institute; Jim Cook, consultant, outdoor and environmental education; Don Ferguson, consultant of geography and educational studies; Jan Montgomery, resource teacher; David Royle, Valley Farm Public School;

and Jay Thibert, Highbush Public School. I would like to thank them for being able to participate in that conference.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ST CATHARINES

Mr Bradley: I rise today to express my support for the plea of the St Catharines and District Labour Council for additional funding to permit the St Catharines Unemployed Help Centre to assist the jobless and their families in this period of recession.

In a letter to the Minister of Labour, President Gabe MacNally writes:

"Dear Bob:

"Just recently we have learned that several unemployed help centres received extra funding from your Ministry to enable them to assist workers involved in plant closures affecting 50 or fewer employees. These areas include Windsor, Cambridge, Hamilton and London.

"We in the St Catharines and District Labour Council must show some disappointment in the fact that the St Catharines Unemployed Help Centre was not made aware of, or was not considered for this extra funding.

"In the Niagara region, we have one of the highest unemployment rates in the country at the present time. Plant closures affecting 50 or fewer are becoming a common occurrence within our region, as your ministry must be aware.

"The labour council has been the official sponsor of our help centre since its conception in 1983. We are requesting your ministry reconsider our help centre for this extra funding. If we cannot be considered for the full amount, maybe sincere consideration should be given to the idea of sharing this extra \$200,000 funding between St Catharines and Niagara Falls.

"As I stated earlier, the type of worker these funds were created to assist is becoming a more common occurrence within our region and our assistance is becoming more of a necessity to our community.

"Your immediate consideration and response to our request would be greatly appreciated."

I fully support the plea of our labour council.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr Carr: I rise to call to the attention of the House a major victory for women in Ontario. On Thursday, 18 April, the Ontario police forces conducted a province-wide sweep against 22 explicit sex video stores, seized large numbers of pornographic videotapes and laid criminal charges.

Halton Regional Police raided sex video outlets in Oakville, Burlington and Halton Hills and seized a total of 120 explicit videos. A number of these videos, depicting various acts of sexual degradation and violence, had received approval of the Ontario Film Review Board whose chairman, Robert Payne, went on record as saying that the problem of the explicit videos was a political one that needed to be addressed.

1340

Well, it was finally addressed, but not by this NDP government. Police have had their hands tied by the Solicitor General who refused to give directions on laying

charges. The courts were powerless as the Attorney General refused to direct crown attorneys to proceed with prosecutions. Women feel betrayed by the new Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations who refused to take a stand against sexually violent pornography. The public is angry that the Premier is looking the other way while community standards are dragged through the mud.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus and especially the member for Burlington South for his persistence in bringing this issue before the government and the Legislature. Thanks to this determination, women and communities across Ontario have won a great victory.

ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN MASSACRE

Mr Owens: Today I am rising in the House to recognize the 76th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. On 24 April 1915, the systematic slaughter of the Armenian people began. When it was over, close to two million men, women and children had been murdered at the hands of the Ottoman Empire.

The Oxford Dictionary defines the word "genocide" as the deliberate extermination of a people or nation. Using phrases like "tragic event" only serves to diminish the true proportion of this systematic extermination. By not calling it exactly what it was—genocide—the memory of those who perished would not be served in a just manner.

The Armenians have proved to be a strong and resilient people. They have survived the genocide, natural disasters in their homeland and recent political upheaval. In the face of great adversity, they have maintained a generosity of spirit which is a lesson to us all.

In closing, I would like to remind this House that we must never forget the atrocities which have been committed against the Armenian people. We must use the lessons we have learned to ensure that this never happens again and to ensure that the tears and anguish of the Armenian people are not in vain.

TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr Conway: Two weeks ago, I had the pleasure of joining a delegation of Ottawa Valley foresters and sawmill operators on the occasion of their visit to New England. The purpose of the trip was to look at two very interesting wood-chip-fired electrical generating plants, one in the city of Burlington, Vermont, the second in Bethlehem in New Hampshire. Like the delegation, which consisted of a number of representatives of the Ontario government, I was very impressed by the application of that wood-based energy technology.

In my part of Ontario, where the forest industry has been extremely important for generations, it is no secret that at the present time the industry is in dire straits. One of the major issues that is contributing to a very difficult situation is that there is no market for the low-end material, whether it is the white birch or poplar standing in the forest or the sawmill residues which are piling up to the consternation of, among others, the Minister of the Environment.

This technology in Burlington and in New Hampshire certainly left the delegation with a very distinct impression that there could be some application of that to at least my part of eastern Ontario. I would take this opportunity to strongly encourage the Minister of Natural Resources, superintendent of the vast crown lands of this province, and the Minister of Energy, in her capacity as architect of energy alternatives for the province, to look very carefully and constructively at the data which will flow back from that trip and to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food for any advice and support which he might like to offer.

ANNIVERSARY OF CHERNOBYL DISASTER

Mr Jackson: Friday 26 April marks the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe in Ukraine, the worst ever recorded in modern history.

Five years ago, the Chernobyl reactor blew tons of radioactive core into the atmosphere. Thousands of people died, while still hundreds of thousands more became chronically ill with diseases such as cancer from the effects of nuclear fallout.

The tragic human and environmental aftermath of Chernobyl continues, and the most vulnerable of Chernobyl's victims are the children. Cradled in the destructive shadow of nuclear clouds, these swollen and bald children are condemned to a life of unceasing pain and despairing uncertainty. As one Ukrainian scientist working in the Chernobyl area recently said: "We are unable to deal with this crisis alone. We need to draw on the expertise and assistance of the international community."

During Earth Week, on behalf of the children and other victims of Chernobyl, I call on the federal and provincial governments to increase efforts to provide that needed assistance, scientific and medical, especially in the area of advanced treatment for radiation-related illnesses. This Friday and again on 5 May vigils will be held in memory of the victims of Chernobyl, at Queen's Park, in which a choir composed exclusively of boys and girls from Chernobyl will participate.

Let us all join in their mourning. May it strengthen our resolve as legislators to help ensure a quick end to the incessant cries coming from Chernobyl. May our hearts hear those cries and may we reach out to those children, as we would our own.

DURHAM COLLEGE

Mr Mills: As members know, this is Earth Week and many activities are taking place around the province to highlight the environment and what we can do to protect it. Families in my riding of Durham East and across the province are worried about what the future holds. We all want clean water, clean air and a better environment for ourselves and our children.

I am pleased to announce today that Durham College in my riding is introducing a new program which will train students to help us in the ongoing fight to clean up the environment. Beginning in September, Durham College will be offering a new three-year diploma program in environmental technology. The focus of the program is to train students in the chemical and biological sciences as they

relate to such areas as monitoring of air and water quality and waste management. For graduates this means excellent career opportunities in the public and the private sector.

Responding to the needs of the community is not new to Durham College. Last year the college helped 2,500 disadvantaged adults and laid-off employees to work towards their education goals.

I ask all members to join with me today to congratulate Durham College staff for developing this exciting new program, and that is one positive statement.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr McLean: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I have been in this Legislature some 10 years and I have never risen on a point of privilege before, but today I am, and I have two different points of privilege that I would like you to hear.

Some time ago the member for Perth recently brought to your attention her privilege as a member regarding question period. Two weeks ago, with unanimous consent of this House, you allowed the member for Perth to ask a question and a supplementary after the time for questions had expired.

It has taken up to 29 minutes for the first two questions in this House on occasion, and opposition parties usually get four questions each, which is normal, on any given day, and we have had, on days, three questions. I know you will say it is the members' own time.

As Speaker, you have assumed the responsibility of chief presiding officer and first administrative officer of the Legislative Assembly. You are responsible for procedural deliberations in the House and for maintaining order and you are the final authority on all matters of dispute which may arise.

ROLE OF SPEAKER

Mr McLean: I understand that you have wine and dine support and maintenance staff of this building. You have wine and dine staff of members' offices with smorgasbord during working hours without members' permission. You have wine and dine the members with a reception featuring lobster, salmon and steak. Mr Speaker, I do not think you are responsible for providing services of a social director at the taxpayers' expense when food banks are virtually empty and people are going hungry.

The other day, on Monday the 22nd, the member for Etobicoke West welcomed some guests and you sent him a note and said that he could not do that. A short time later the member for York West welcomed someone. You listened and said nothing.

It is the duty of the Speaker to fulfil his or her duties as the rules indicate and control the business of the House in an orderly fashion. Since you appear unable or unwilling to do so, I think you should resign as Speaker.

The Speaker: To the member for Simcoe East, I appreciate the concerns which he brings to my attention. With respect to question period routine, I would like to refer the member to the statement which I made to the House Thursday past, and am pleased to inform the member that on that day in fact we had a record 15 questions

asked, with, I might add, the co-operation of all members of the House, co-operation which I deeply appreciate. Yesterday, which was an unusual day—shall we describe it as—none the less we had 10 questions, certainly above the average which we had been accomplishing previously.

1350

I must also remind the member that it was not that long ago that in fact we were averaging 12, 13 or even 14 questions per day and that it was in the last two weeks where we experienced some difficulties. I anticipate that those difficulties have in fact been ironed out and that we will indeed be able to handle somewhere between 12 and 15 questions per day, or who knows, with the suggestions of certain members, even as many as 100.

With respect to the other matters raised, I certainly would be very pleased to communicate at a future date with the member for Simcoe East, but I appreciate him drawing these matters to my attention.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

MUNICIPAL ENUMERATION

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: I would like to inform honourable members that the mailing of the 1991 municipal enumeration forms is now under way. Beginning today, my ministry will mail close to five million municipal enumeration forms to all households in the province. The enumeration forms will be accompanied by an information/instruction brochure that explains how the information collected during the enumeration will be used. One adult in each household is asked to check the accuracy of the pre-printed information provided on the form, make any corrections or additions necessary, sign the form and mail it in a postage pre-paid envelope by 10 May.

As members will be aware, the enumeration is conducted every three years in the same year as the municipal election. One of the main reasons for the enumeration is to prepare preliminary voters' lists for the 12 November municipal and school board election. The information collected during the enumeration is also used to direct school tax support, to prepare lists of potential jurors and to update assessment records.

Since this is only the second time that the enumeration is being done by mail, the ministry has prepared a public information strategy to ensure that Ontario residents are aware of the enumeration process and understand the need to complete and return the form by 10 May.

The ministry is also offering a telephone hotline for anyone who has questions about enumeration or needs assistance in completing the form.

In addition, enumeration information kits have been sent to members' constituency offices and a wide range of organizations, ensuring that they are fully prepared to offer their assistance in the province-wide campaign. We hope that these groups will inform their members about the enumeration and, if necessary, help people with the completion of the form. The kit contains a form, a brochure, a poster and an article suitable for use in newsletters and bulletins.

I know that all members will join with me in making every effort to ensure that their constituents are aware of the enumeration and fully participate in it. The enumeration is, after all, a very important first step in ensuring that people get on the municipal voters' lists and that they have a voice in shaping their communities.

RESPONSES

MUNICIPAL ENUMERATION

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am very glad that the Minister of Revenue has made a statement today on her plans for the enumeration process for this year's municipal elections. I believe that the mailed enumeration system and forms that were implemented by the Liberal government in 1988 were the beginning of an effective initiative to ensure that all municipal residents are enumerated as conveniently and as close to home as possible.

This is still, however, a very new procedure, and proper staffing of that hotline that the minister has mentioned and the public relations campaign that will accompany the mailout are very, very important. I would suggest that human resources to the fullest extent be devoted to this fundamental human right, the right to be enumerated and the right then to vote.

In 1988, when this process was first begun, the ministries of Revenue, Education and Municipal Affairs determined major inadequacies in the self-identification of school board support. I was part of that process. Since that time, it has most unfortunately happened that school boards across this province have been solely responsible for educating the public on this matter. May I add, this has happened at a time when school board financing is on its tightest rope, when limited resources are available to school boards.

I want to bring to the House an injustice that sits still, and knowledge has been there for at least three years and nothing has been done, although we were on the verge of doing something as we proceeded. I hope that we are now going to know that the francophones in this province still in self-identification have a very onerous procedure to follow. If they do not self-identify correctly, they are automatically placed on public support, and that support is anglophone. Even if they are separate school supporters, they automatically go on public rolls in the English or anglophone sector school board.

I hope that this public information campaign will be directed particularly at francophones, the francophone community will be supported in its efforts to educate its residents and that tax dollars of the school boards will not have to be directed to this endeavour and that we will be using every media resource available in the communities across this province to make this as efficient as possible. I know that every MPP in this chamber will do his or her utmost to help all residents to be enumerated as quickly and as efficiently as possible.

I hope the minister will be able to identify her plans for market value reassessment as clearly as she has made this statement about enumeration, because yesterday's statement was certainly a teeter-totter political statement, and enumeration and assessment are very closely tied. We are

talking about the largest community in this province and we still do not know what direction we are going.

Mr Stockwell: This is a bit of earth-shattering news from the Revenue minister today. I am happy that we are getting this forward.

I am still a little more interested, in particular, in market value assessment and her fence-sitting approach that she took yesterday, issuing a statement that really said nothing about where her party stood on the issue. More people in Metropolitan Toronto are asking me specifically about her party's position on market value assessment and where they are going. Very few have asked me about the mailing process for enumeration. Noble thoughts, good to bring it forward, but I hardly think it is the kind of earth-shattering news that the people in Metropolitan Toronto would like to hear. The news that they would like to hear from her ministry and this government is, have they flip-flopped on market value assessment like they have flip-flopped on practically every other issue they addressed in Agenda for People and previous to the election?

The minister could also spend a little bit of time and her staff's time reviewing the cross-border shopping issue. We are losing potentially, in some cases, upwards of \$1 billion a day. Her ministry cannot identify the amount of moneys we are losing. Her ministry cannot identify the amounts of money it is losing. They cannot seem to identify how much, where, when, and when she comes before a committee all she can say to us is: "Gee, we don't know. Why don't you blame the feds?"

There are a lot of pressing issues facing her ministry and a lot of pressing issues that the people of Ontario would like to hear about. This, I do not believe, is one of those pressing issues. If she could stand up and make a statement on any of those, I think the people in this province, particularly in the affected areas, would be very interested, not the least of which, as I said, is market value assessment and the cross-border shopping issue.

One point I would like to make within this is that the minister is enumerating the homeless. How does she propose to mail to the homeless to ensure that they get enumerated under this process of hers? I think that is a very important question, since her government has given the commitment to in fact enumerate the homeless and have them vote next election.

Probably, if this government carries on for another four or five years, that is what this province will end up with: homeless, penniless people without principles if they follow the lead of the government.

PREMIER'S COMMENTS

Mr Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: My point of order refers to rule 23(b), which prohibits a member from imputing false or unavowed motives to another member. The rule is one that has always been adhered to in this House, but the Premier, in his statement outside the House reported in this afternoon's *Star* by Mr Maychak, said as follows, referring to the opposition parties, "'They're not out for justice, they're out for revenge,' the New Democrat Premier said of his Liberal and Tory foes."

I want to point out to you, sir, that while he has every right to express an inappropriate decision, a personal decision, to the press, I hope you will tell him that a statement of that nature made in this House would be out of order and against the rules, and in that connection I can assure him that his personal assumption is incorrect.

The Speaker: I appreciate the member's raising the point of order with me and doing so before we start question period. The member may know that the rule to which he refers applies to activities within the House. The Speaker has no jurisdiction over statements made outside of the House, but none the less I take his comments seriously.

Mr Nixon: Normally, the challenge to a critic is a dare to repeat it outside the House. In this instance, I would suggest to the Premier and to you, sir, that he may not say that in this House. It is against the rules, it is wrong and it is incorrect.

1400

ORAL QUESTIONS

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: A question to the Premier: I was impressed and interested in the news release from the Attorney General that came to my desk yesterday, and it says as follows, "We have asked an outside police force, namely the RCMP, to review all circumstances surrounding the incident." The incident is the reference to the Solicitor General's office inadvertently and without his knowledge interfering with the proper course of justice by writing a justice of the peace and asking him to reconsider a certain charge.

Under the circumstances, that we now have the Solicitor General's activities and his office's activities being reviewed by the RCMP, would the Premier not consider it appropriate, while he considers the final disposition of the minister, that he ask him to step aside until the RCMP make their report to the Attorney General and, hopefully, through the Attorney General to this House and the public?

Hon Mr Rae: For all the reasons I gave yesterday—as I heard the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, he accepted entirely the statement and the word of the Solicitor General—that he did not authorize the letter, that he did not write the letter, that he had nothing to do with the letter, that the letter was not sent by him or approved by him, but that it was sent and written by other people, I think it would be exaggerated and in the circumstances unfair of me to ask or to expect that the Solicitor General should step aside. From what I have heard and from all that I heard yesterday, I have not heard anything to suggest that the Solicitor General has done anything wrong at all.

Mr Nixon: It is certainly not my intention to thrash all the old straw other than to say to the Premier that we are aware of all those matters, and yet the doctrine of ministerial responsibility is one which the Premier must understand. He has said so and reiterated it on uncounted occasions. If I have any criticism of the Solicitor General, it is that instead of saying, "I refuse to resign," as one of

the previous ministers said, he should have offered his resignation.

In my view, the decision is not with the Solicitor General. There is no doubt that under his responsibility there is a clear interference with the course of justice. But the responsibility would lie then, as of course it does whatever the Solicitor General says, totally with the Premier whether he continues permanently or whether he continues while the RCMP investigate these activities.

The implication in the Premier's comments is clear, that the RCMP will not be investigating the Solicitor General. Can he assure us, therefore, that the RCMP will not be questioning the Solicitor General as to his responsibilities over his staff or the inadequate exercise of his responsibility that permitted an employee of the Solicitor General to write such a totally inappropriate and unacceptable letter?

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition would know full well that it would be utterly inappropriate for me to comment at all on the police investigation, and it would be, except to say that from what I have heard from what has been put before me as the first minister, from all that I have heard, the Solicitor General did not write the letter; he did not approve the letter; he did not authorize the letter; he did not sign the letter; and he did not send the letter. In that circumstance, I continue to believe that the Solicitor General should be held politically responsible for the mistakes he makes and for the things he does that are his fault, but it is not fair to hold him responsible for things that are not his fault.

Mr Nixon: The Premier knows and has said previously that ministers are responsible for the actions they take and for the actions of their office. We understand the circumstances, but I am particularly concerned that the Premier indicates he can say nothing about this since it is now under police investigation. It seems strange that he would indicate publicly to the House that the whole matter is absurd and ridiculous and then ask the Attorney General to put a lid on it all by calling in the RCMP. That is precisely what has been done.

If the implication is that the Premier cannot respond to questions because the RCMP has been called in, then I would say in this instance the Premier is further shirking his undoubted responsibilities. What has he got to say about that?

Hon Mr Rae: What I have to say about that is this—

Mr Nixon: I had to make it interrogative.

Hon Mr Rae: I understand that.

What I have to say about that is this: First of all, the basic facts of the situation and what I was responding to yesterday are quite simply this, was the Solicitor General at fault for having written a letter, for having sent a letter, for having done any of those things? The minister has stated in this House and I have the assurance from him and I have absolutely not a shred of evidence—no one has suggested that he is not telling the truth in that regard, no one at all.

To suggest that I would in any way, shape or form have any comment to make or interfere in the scope of any questions being asked anybody at any time by the police is

completely improper. It would be entirely improper in terms of the way the world works for the first minister to be involved in any way, shape or form with respect to a police investigation.

Mr Scott: The Premier's response, and my question is to him, to this whole issue over the last couple of days indicates clearly that he needs a vacation, a paid vacation, of course, and I know all members of the House would be delighted to see him have it.

The possibility that he could denounce as absurd, meaningless and ridiculous—I do not think he used the word "hooey" in this context—the very allegations against the Solicitor General and then the very same day turn around and regard it as sufficiently important to call in the Mounties for a thorough investigation shows that the grip is slowly loosening at the Premier's office.

The Premier has basically two defences to this. The first is that it is all an act of revenge. My office did not write this letter trying to fix a case; the Solicitor General's office did. So we will leave that one there for the moment. The second defence is that the Solicitor General is innocent because somebody signed his name on the letter in his office. Section 24 of the guidelines, as the Premier knows—he wrote them and I guess he must have read them—makes perfectly plain that the minister is responsible for the actions of his office. Indeed, it would be an absurdity if he was not responsible for the actions of his office. Yesterday the minister told the House he had authorized his staff to write and sign letters with his name.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Scott: The question I want to ask, because I want to be interrogatory in form too, is a question the Premier used to ask often and it is this: In the face of the minister's admission that he authorized his staff to write and sign letters of a routine nature, which is admitted, how can he argue that the minister is not responsible for his acts? To use the Premier's phrase, where does the buck in this administration stop? Is it going to stop with some young woman in Cambridge in the minister's office or is the Premier going to take his responsibility seriously?

1410

Hon Mr Rae: As I have learned since 6 September, the buck stops with me. I have made a judgement and I will be judged accordingly by the House, by the electorate and by everyone else. I understand that.

I would say to the member for St George-St David that the Solicitor General did not write the letter; he did not sign the letter; he did not authorize the letter; he did not send the letter.

I go back to a basic point of fairness. The minister is responsible for answering questions. He is responsible for taking on the policy questions. He is responsible for the conduct of his administration. I appreciate that. If a letter goes out that should not have gone out from his constituency office, that no one thinks is appropriate, it would be unfair, in the circumstances, to say the minister should be fired, should resign, should be dismissed, should be gone simply because of that fact. I stand by that judgement.

I think the people who are watching, who could appreciate in their own lives, in their own offices, in their own experience, should ask themselves the question: Do they think that they should be fired if somebody else sends out a letter in their name? Is that what they think? I do not think they think that.

Mr Scott: The people of Ontario who are watching this presumably will want to know that all the police officers who work in the Ontario Provincial Police for the Solicitor General, and all the police officers for whom I had the honour to act in practice in many years in municipalities across Ontario, when faced with an allegation that has justified a criminal investigation, step aside from their job. They are paid while they are away. I am not asking that the Solicitor General's pay should be docked—heaven forbid—but I am saying it seems to me entirely appropriate that he should meet the standards he imposes on police officers all across the province of Ontario and that are contained in the Police Act.

When will the Premier require the Solicitor General to do what every policeman in Ontario is expected to do as a matter of custom and of law? We do not need one rule for police officers and another rule for ministers selected by the Premier.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me say to the member for St George-St David that there is no allegation against the Solicitor General. There is none.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: No, there is none. No, there is not. If I could be permitted to respond, I have never heard of an instance where a police chief or a police officer was fired or was asked to step aside because of something a secretary did or a member of the office staff did. I would ask again that members—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: The member for St George-St David says, "Get a grip." Members opposite should let me return a favour and tell them to get a grip and put this in some perspective.

Mr Scott: Yesterday, when he was trying to appeal to the audience in TV land in making his points, the Premier emphasized the importance of fairness. I refer not only to police officers—

Interjections.

Mr Scott: The members on the other side of the House can hoot me down, but they are going to have to deal with the people of Ontario.

A police officer against whom an allegation is made that is serious and that is subject to police investigation is suspended with pay. A public servant, among the thousands of public servants who work for this government, who confronts an allegation that warrants a police investigation is suspended with pay. I know the Premier may be short-staffed in that cabinet, but why is it that when he and the Attorney General submit the Solicitor General to a police investigation by an outside police force, this man, unlike all those others who work for the province day in, day out, is not suspended, is entitled to carry on his job?

What job? The job of enforcing the law against an allegation that he tried to fix a criminal case.

Hon Mr Rae: The Leader of the Opposition talked about statements that are made inside and outside the House. I want to say to the member for St George-St David in all sincerity that if he is making the allegation—

Mr Scott: It is the letter. Read the letter.

Hon Mr Rae: No, no. The member cannot get around what he said. His words are there. I just want to say to him that what he is saying in the House is what no one else is saying. There is no such allegation that has been made, until he just made it, against the member for Cambridge. There is no such allegation.

I would say to the member for St George-St David that the reason that I have made my judgement—

Mr Scott: Read the letter.

Hon Mr Rae: I would say to the member for St George-St David, who is so busy heckling at the moment, that the basic facts of the case, as I understand them, have not been disputed by anyone. I have made a judgement for which I will myself, at some point or other, by the electorate and by others, be judged. I stand by the judgement, and that is that in this instance, where we have absolutely not a shred of evidence to suggest that the member was involved, that he authorized, that he approved, that he thought it was proper—when in fact we had the clearest indication that this is not something he would have or could have authorized or would have done—I want to suggest to the member for St George-St David that in those circumstances it would be improper and unfair of me to simply say to the member, "Begone because of something that happened in Cambridge, in your constituency office, of which you were entirely unaware." I do not think that is any different a standard than I would apply to a public servant, than I would ask to be applied to anybody who is working for a living.

Mr Harris: Since the Premier is really not interested in conducting any kind of investigation into this vis-à-vis his own guidelines, which I assume the RCMP is not being called in for, I would like to ask the Solicitor General specifically—and quite frankly I am disappointed that it is being left to question period and to this House to have to pursue this, but I see no other option in the abdication of the Premier's responsibility. So I ask the Solicitor General: Yesterday, he admitted that he had given blanket authorization to his staff to sign his name to routine correspondence.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The last time I counted, there was one Premier. The question was directed to the Premier and therefore—

An hon member: No it wasn't. It was to the Solicitor General.

The Speaker: Sorry, to the Solicitor General. There is only one of him, and so I would expect one person to be responding. I would like the leader of the third party to be able to place his question.

Mr Harris: I will repeat, since some people in the government started to yippy-yap before I got a chance to

finish. The Solicitor General said yesterday, I believe—I can bring out the Hansard, if he likes—that he gave a blanket authorization to his staff to sign his name to routine correspondence. That is what he said, routine correspondence.

1420

We now know that two of those letters were sent out to members of the justice system. I would like the Solicitor General to tell this House if he, as Solicitor General, as the chief law officer of the crown, ever specifically instructed his staff that they were never, never to send any correspondence as part of this blanket authorization for those letters he gave them, that they were never, never to send any correspondence to anyone connected with the justice system. Did the Solicitor General instruct his staff with that?

Hon Mr Farnan: Let me point out a couple of facts. Number one is that “blanket” means “all.” So there is an error in the interpretation of the leader of the third party. There was never any blanket authority given to my staff. There was permission for them in terms of some routine letters. So now we have a distinction; some letters are routine and some letters are not routine. When I go back to my constituency, a member of my staff has distinguished some letters that are not routine. That means there is a distinction made.

Let me add this point. In terms of guidelines, conflict guidelines were sent to my constituency and received by my constituency on 4 March. Those conflict guidelines clearly indicate that writing to the judiciary is inappropriate. Now, my understanding is that the letters in question are after that date. So the answer is yes, both in writing and verbally I have said there must be an arm’s length from the Solicitor General to the judiciary. Yes, yes, yes.

Mr Harris: Let me be very specific. Not by way of some correspondence that went to his staff, but I would like the Solicitor General to tell me if he in person instructed all of his staff directly that they were never, never, never to write a letter, any correspondence, to anyone connected with the justice system. Did he instruct his staff, he personally, he as Solicitor General, verbally, directly?

Hon Mr Farnan: On numerous occasions, from the very moment that I was elected Solicitor General. The first briefing I got from my deputy minister was that there must be an arm’s-length distance between this office and the judiciary. I went back to Cambridge and I took my ministry staff and I said, “Look, our policy is arm’s length, arm’s length from the judiciary.” The answer is yes.

Mr Harris: I do not know why the Solicitor General has difficulty answering the question directly. There was some—

Interjections.

Mr Harris: Well, members can all laugh. The RCMP will be asking the question. There is a difference in suggesting arm’s length and saying, “You are never, never, never to send a letter.” That is directly the question.

This morning, on CBC Metro Morning, Richard Johnston, a key member of the NDP, stated, “The real question of ministerial responsibility is whether or not Mr Farnan’s staff were instructed never, never to do any correspondence

that was directed to the justice system in the position of minister.” If that instruction were not specifically given, not by way of ministerial staff saying, “Don’t forget the arm’s-length thing,” not by way of a memo that went out from the Premier’s office with guidelines—he said, “Never, never,” and if a direct instruction were not given, then the minister is culpable and should have to leave the cabinet. Does the Solicitor General agree with that assessment?

Hon Mr Farnan: I have difficulty following the rambling thoughts of the leader of the third party.

I will make two points. I have reiterated, because it is very, very fundamental to my thinking, I have consistently reiterated to my staff that I believe in the principle of separation between my office and the judiciary. I have emphasized that. Not only have I emphasized it by telling them, I have emphasized it by example, by not being involved in such a process.

Mr Harris: My second question is to the Premier. After three days there has been no ministerial acceptance of responsibility by him as first minister, there has been no ministerial acceptance of responsibility by the Solicitor General. All we have heard are accusations against employees.

An hon member: And against the opposition.

Mr Harris: And against the opposition, that is quite true.

I would ask the Premier whether he believes that responsibility lies with him or with the Solicitor General.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me try to say with respect to this question of ministerial responsibility, and indeed the responsibility of the Premier, that I am here on a daily basis, as are other ministers, answering questions. We are responsible for the conduct of the administration. We are trying to provide answers and we are trying to indicate clearly the responsibility of the government for what happens.

I realize that as first minister, given the nature of our political system, I perhaps bear a little bit more responsibility for the conduct of the government than do others. But I think it would be a mistake to leap from that basic constitutional assumption, which is central to our parliamentary system, to the next step, which is the one which he is asking us to take, that every mistake that happens leads automatically to the firing and the pillorying of one member of the cabinet or another or of one member of the government or another.

I do not think that is what constitutional responsibility is all about. That is the difference that I have. I am prepared to answer and to take responsibility and to take political responsibility for what takes place and to exercise judgement. The member for Ottawa Centre demonstrated that last Thursday in terms of her willingness to take responsibility for what happens. There is no question about that. But I think there is a difference in leaping from that to suggesting that every time somebody on staff makes a mistake the minister gets fired, because that—

The Speaker: Would the Premier take his seat, please? Supplementary.

Mr Harris: We have had Ministry of Health staff accessing and disclosing confidential information. We have had Ministry of Northern Development staff writing inappropriate letters on behalf of the minister. We have had NDP riding presidents making announcements on behalf of the government. We have had NDP faithful posing as members of the Legislature, in the case of Simcoe West. We have civil servants writing and signing letters for the Premier and now on behalf of the Solicitor General on police matters. I suggest to the Premier that on all of these matters the buck stops with him.

I am suggesting to him as well that his lackadaisical, laissez-faire attitude to all of these matters is leading members of his party and of his staff and his ministers to not treat the guidelines seriously. He has set himself up to be chief judge and enforcer of the cabinet and thus their staff. Somebody then has to take responsibility. The Solicitor General, the chief law officer of the crown, has not taken that responsibility, much to the disgrace of his position, for all Solicitor Generals before him. Will the Premier take that responsibility?

1430

Hon Mr Rae: I hope the leader of the third party will understand when I say that I have a slightly more positive view of my record and the government's record than he does.

I will say to him quite simply that, in the basic sense of our political system, obviously I take responsibility for the conduct of the government, but I also have to exercise some judgement on an individual basis and on individual days. I would say to the member just in response that he was a member, that he was here, that he was in the government—I do not think he was in the cabinet, but he was certainly on this side of the House—when Mr Miller's budget was found on the street. For two days, we had a very extensive debate in the House on what it all meant. There was a similar debate in Ottawa when the budget was leaked in Ottawa, for which the Minister of Finance could not be held responsible.

I must say, on balance, I believe that a fair assessment would be, yes, to blame us and hold us, in every direct sense, politically accountable for what happens—that is fine—and then to say, "Look, Mr Speaker, it's only fair that when the ultimate penalty, the penalty of being fired, of being dismissed, should relate to questions of personal responsibility and personal conduct with respect to the overall administration of—

The Speaker: Would the Premier take his seat, please.

Mr Harris: There is no question that the Premier's conflict-of-interest guidelines have been violated. I do not think that is in question by anyone. The question is, who is going to accept responsibility for this? So far, all we have heard is that we are going to blame staff and we are going to have an RCMP investigation.

This breach of the Premier's guidelines will not be part of the RCMP investigation. We have already heard that. Will the Premier today agree to send this matter to the standing committee on administration of justice of the Legislature, where it can be fully investigated by all parties

of the House, where the staff will have an opportunity to come before the committee so they can have their side of it, since on this political argument, since on the breach of the Premier's guidelines, they are the ones who are being accused and found guilty in absentia? Will the Premier agree to that?

Hon Mr Rae: There is, as the leader of the third party will know, an investigation going on at this point. I would say to him again that he has made an allegation and an assertion that the guidelines have been broken. With great respect, the member has already indicated that he took steps with respect to making it clear what the guidelines are. There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that he at any time, contrary to the allegation made in this House by the member for St George-St David, had anything to do with any suggestion whatsoever with respect to interference or anything to do with the justice system at all. Therefore, my basic answer to the member is that we take responsibility for what is taking place in the government in the broadest sense. It does not mean that people get fired every time something happens.

Mr Nixon: The Premier has reiterated his defence on a number of occasions. The part of it that has come to my special attention during the last few minutes is the implication that somehow this is just a little mistake that has happened, that the minister did not properly select his staff for competence, that he did not properly instruct them, that somewhere, somebody up in Cambridge wrote a letter that was improperly signed. It has come to our attention that a number of letters to justices of the peace in this regard have been mailed improperly, that a letter went to the Minister of Transportation which the minister denies ever having received, in spite of the fact that it was a clear intrusion into the administration of justice. The Premier says that every time something like that happens, surely we should not require a resignation.

I think his defence would apply perhaps to the fact that his cheque-writing machine signed a letter for the Premier to somebody up in Barrie about some natural resources matter that had to be corrected. Frankly, that did not have any great impact, according to the stories that we have heard, and the Premier's office got in touch with him and said that letter should not have been signed. We are not calling upon the Premier for his resignation for that purpose.

But he is a lawyer, may God help me, he is a QC. He must understand that this is not just an ordinary intrusion or a mistake by an employee or even by a jejune minister, whatever that is. This is an instance where the Solicitor General, through his office, has interfered in the freedom of the justice system.

I cannot believe that the Premier will continue in this stonewalling, repetitious defence when in fact the matter is much more serious than he is prepared to accept. Frankly, if it goes to a committee, as suggested by the leader of the third party, that would be useful, but it is tantamount to us saying "Well, you win, I guess you are right, your man is going to be maintained simply because of the authority of

the Premier and in spite of all of the facts. If it goes to a committee, that's fine."

Will the Premier not give further personal consideration to this matter, and at the very least, move the Solicitor General out of his responsibilities until the RCMP report on this matter?

Hon Mr Rae: The member says, will I give further consideration every time he asks a question. He is entitled to ask questions on this for as long or as often as he likes. I understand that.

I just want to say in response that I have made a judgement which I feel, despite all the controversy yesterday and so on, on balance is still the right one to make, and I would also say to the member that he has in his question, as did the member for St George-St David, drawn conclusions with respect to the conduct of the minister and the conduct of others which are entirely unfair and which extend well beyond, if I may say so, the conclusions that can fairly be drawn.

I do not want to say anything more than that except to say that I really think that in the circumstances the Leader of the Opposition is simply going too far, and I would just make that observation.

Mr Nixon: The Premier has made his judgement on his minister, and now he is making his judgement on me. While I presume he is the final arbiter for the minister, I have an independent position in this and I reject his view.

All I can do is look at this administration and see that the RCMP are investigating the Solicitor General and his office. If he is denying that they will ask him questions, then he really is out to lunch.

The Ontario Provincial Police, which are subject to the Solicitor General's direction under the Information and Privacy Commissioner, are trying to find out what happened in the Ministry of Health that ended up in the unfortunate resignation of the Minister of Health. The Conflict of Interest Commissioner is reviewing the submission made by the Minister of Community and Social Services. We are awaiting that matter as well.

The former Attorney General has said to the Premier, "Get a grip on yourself," but I say to the Premier, while all those things are going on, this is a clear-cut case that rests solely with him. Will he not accept the advice of myself, the opposition members and learned members of the community at large, in spite of his view that his fairness principle is being accepted, that the Solicitor General must not and cannot continue with his responsibilities?

Hon Mr Rae: I think it is fair to say that I simply have a different opinion than the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Harnick: I am not a QC, so I am somewhat confused about some of these answers and I guess that might be the reason.

My question is to the Premier. If there is no problem here with motive, if the Solicitor General has not done anything wrong and it was all someone else's fault, if it is not a serious situation, why are the Mounties being called in to investigate? That is my question.

1440

Hon Mr Rae: I have nothing at all to do with the RCMP investigation.

Mr Harnick: I am somewhat shocked that the Premier, who heads this government, has no idea why the RCMP are investigating. Would the Premier tell us who is being investigated and what is being investigated if nothing is wrong?

Hon Mr Rae: The honourable member is a lawyer and I know he would hate to live in a system and in a society—as I would—where the Premier of the province would pick up the phone and say to the police, "Conduct an investigation" in such and such a situation. We do not live in that kind of a society. Thank goodness, we do not live in that kind of a society.

Mr Harnick: Great contradiction here, Bob.

Hon Mr Rae: No. There is no contradiction whatsoever. The allegation has been made. It has been stated in the House and has been said on a number of occasions. The Leader of the Opposition said the Solicitor General is under investigation. That is not correct. The circumstances surrounding the sending of the letter and the letter itself are the subject of an investigation. What will conclude from that, what will be the result of that, what consequences will flow from that, neither I nor the member for Willowdale nor anybody in this House can possibly comment on or know because it is not for us to decide in any way, shape or form.

LAND-USE PLANNING

Mr O'Connor: My question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As the minister knows, all five regions in the greater Toronto area are undergoing an official plan review. In the case of York region, I would like to point out that for the very first time an official plan hopefully will be developed. York region has seen unplanned urban sprawl and a real estate bingo that constituted planning under previous governments.

What is the minister doing to ensure that the official plans in these areas across the province are going to reflect the high expectations of the people that this government takes planning seriously?

Hon Mr Cooke: The ministry officials from Municipal Affairs have met with officials from York region on several occasions. The member is correct to indicate that York region is working on an official plan and, I might say, the first official plan for that region. They have been working on it for a number of years, and we have indicated very clearly to the officials as well as the elected council of York region that criteria and principles of good planning including the environment, protection of agricultural land, and the moraine up in that area must be protected before we in this government and my ministry will approve the official plan.

Mr O'Connor: Is the minister confident then that this will protect rural areas, the agricultural lands and the natural area including the Oak Ridges moraine, which I have a large portion of in my riding?

Hon Mr Cooke: I certainly appreciate the interest that the member shows in this very important planning issue in our province. I can assure the member that we are determined to use all of the powers that are necessary under the Municipal Affairs legislation to ensure the people of that region that a good and effective official plan is approved by that council and by this government.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Scott: I have a question for the Attorney General. It is a two-part question. First of all, will he tell the House whether he discussed with the Premier or anybody in the Premier's office the propriety of or any interest in calling an RCMP investigation before it was called? Second, is the investigation broad enough so the RCMP can interrogate and investigate the Solicitor General?

Hon Mr Hampton: To reply to the honourable member's question, the investigation into the incident was launched by myself after conferring with senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General. That decision was discussed with no one else other than senior legal advisers in the ministry.

The second part of the question is that the RCMP have been advised to conduct an investigation into the incident, and I want to say to the honourable member that just on the material that I have received and I have reviewed with senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General, there is some complexity to this issue.

Mr Scott: I think the Attorney General is very wise not to express any conclusion about the investigation, but I think we have it clear, do we not, that the RCMP investigation authorized by the Attorney General of the province is broad enough to permit the interrogation of the Solicitor General and is broad enough to permit the RCMP to recommend criminal charges, if it is their wish to do so? Whether they will be laid or not is another question. I have that right, have I?

Hon Mr Hampton: To respond, I did not instruct the RCMP as to who they were to interrogate. As I understand it, senior legal advisers met with the RCMP and outlined the information they had. I would expect that the RCMP will interview whoever they feel they have to interview in respect to investigating this incident.

I would also say to the member that I would expect that as a natural, normal course of these matters, once the RCMP have collected all the information which they believe is relevant, they will come back to senior legal advisers and will sit down and present that information and they will discuss the legal relevance of it at that time.

Mr Harris: To the Attorney General: He has heard all of the statements that the Premier has made, and he is a member of his cabinet, saying that it is not a serious matter, no problem with the Solicitor General, we are dealing with a five-week probationary employee who inadvertently made a mistake. Why, when this was the Premier's response, did the Attorney General call in the RCMP?

Hon Mr Hampton: I would not assume some of the conclusions that the leader of the third party has assumed here in terms of who is to blame, etc. I make no assumptions

as to that in terms of the enforcement of the law, no assumptions whatsoever. I merely say to him that when an incident like this happens, if I, as Attorney General, did not order an investigation into that, I am sure if I came into the House I would be pilloried for not having ordered an investigation. I feel it is only appropriate in terms of law enforcement in the province that we investigate these incidents.

Mr Harris: We are finding out some very, very strange motives for how the justice system is being administered by this government. I want to be very clear on a matter that was raised just a moment ago, and that is that the Attorney General decided, in spite of all the statements that his Premier had made, to call in the RCMP to conduct an investigation, and in making that decision, he had no discussions with the Premier or the Premier's office and the advice that he got was from his senior advisers, he got no advice from the Premier or the Premier's office before he made that decision to call in the RCMP.

Hon Mr Hampton: To be very clear, it would be inappropriate for me to discuss with any member of the cabinet any aspects of this incident. I meet with senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General. We look at the incident that we have in terms of the facts that we receive and we try to determine if there may be some legal significance to those facts.

Based upon the information and the facts we received, we determined, again with the advice of senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General, that it would be appropriate to investigate this incident to see if the incident has any legal significance to it in terms of who may have breached the law, if there was any breach of the law.

1450

FRENCH-LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Mrs MacKinnon: My question is to the honourable Minister of Education. A number of my constituents in Lambton county have raised questions as to whether school boards are obliged to provide French-language education to francophones. Could the minister please clarify this matter for my constituents?

Hon Mrs Boyd: The right of francophone parents to demand an education in French is there in our Constitution and has been upheld by the courts. It is provided in a number of ways in the province and there is that right. In some cases, there is an individual school board. In most cases, it is as a section of another school board.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Conway: My question is to the Premier and it concerns the conduct of the Solicitor General. As I hope my friends will observe, I have tried to be dispassionate in this. I rise today because, quite frankly, the Premier encouraged me to recall the Miller incident of the famous Ontario budget of 1983, in which there was a leak, a very interesting matter which members may recall where certain reporters were able to find pieces of the budget in a waste disposal site somewhere in the city of Toronto.

Taking the Premier's advice to recall that incident, I went back to Hansard of that famous Friday morning in

May 1983 and, following the Premier's advice, I read what he had to say about the then Treasurer at the time.

Mr Bradley: What did he say?

Mr Conway: Time does not permit, but I say most seriously that on that occasion of Friday 6 May 1983, the member for York South, the then leader of the New Democratic Party, was full and clear about the doctrine of ministerial responsibility. He said, and I quote, that the then Treasurer had no choice but to resign, because the doctrine of ministerial responsibility, sometimes tough, sometimes rough, left no room.

The Speaker: And your question?

Mr Conway: Mindful of that incident and mindful of the standard the Premier then established, in light of what his own Solicitor General has done, how can he not ask the Solicitor General to step down by virtue of not only his own guidelines but also what he said about what Frank Miller did and what the Premier said that Frank Miller was duty-bound to have done?

Hon Mr Rae: I think it is important to note that the establishment of constitutional precedent, if you like, or the establishment of a basic set of rules is established by what actually happened in that instance. In that instance it was the general view, I think, of the public and of people that—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Rae: I would say to the member for Renfrew North, whose dispassion on partisan issues is well known, that in the Wilson case, which I also referred him to, my reaction was very different. In fact, I had a very different reaction even from the leader of my federal party in public. I was in fact quoted against my federal leader because I said that I thought it was ridiculous to demand Mr Wilson's resignation when he had nothing to do with the circumstances involving the situation.

I would only say that given all that has taken place over the last time, given the precedents that have clearly been established here and elsewhere in the Commonwealth, I do not believe that the doctrine of ministerial responsibility applies that far. I just do not believe it.

Mr Conway: Having taken the Premier's advice to read what he said in calling for Frank Miller's resignation, I read to the House part of what the then leader, the now Premier, said in demanding the then Treasurer's resignation. I quote:

"If sometimes" these doctrines of ministerial responsibility "mete out a justice that seems a little hard in some circumstances, that is the way it has to be to protect the basic traditions of this place, to maintain the essentials of budget secrecy and to maintain the principle that a minister is responsible for what goes on in his jurisdiction and in his department." He concludes that a responsible minister "must bear personal responsibility before us, as representatives of the citizens of this province, for sins of commission and for sins of omission as well."

I repeat: Applying the Bob Rae standard of 1983 on top of the Bob Rae guidelines of 1990-91, how is it that the

Solicitor General ought not to withdraw, at least until such time as this Mountie investigation has concluded?

Hon Mr Rae: For the simple reason that he neither authorized nor wrote nor sent nor had anything at all to do with the letter, and I do not believe for a moment that the doctrine of ministerial responsibility extends in that direction.

Mr Harris: I know the assertion that the Premier makes, that Frank Miller in fact authorized and encouraged and said, "Let's see if we can leak this sucker," will be well received by the former Premier of this province to whom the Premier makes that—

Hon Mr Rae: Don't be silly.

Mr Harris: Well, the Premier should listen to the question and read his answer and tell me what else a former Premier of this province can imply that he is saying.

My question is to the Premier. I was quite shocked, quite frankly, and I am a little disappointed that when I went to ask the Attorney General why he called in the RCMP, in effect he said: "To create a political smokescreen, because you would be upset here. That's why." The only reason he gave me was that the opposition would be upset.

Given the fact that the Attorney General, by the way of his answer seems to be implying that, and I happen to believe it is a political smokescreen, will the Premier agree to send this matter to the justice committee and give it the power to bring before it the people involved in this, so we can get to the matter of his guidelines?

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, with respect to the first part of the member's question, the suggestion is completely unfair in the circumstances in terms of my answer to the previous question, completely unfair, and the member knows it is. His second allegation, with respect to the answer of the Attorney General, is totally without any foundation whatsoever. It is an allegation drawn out of thin air that is entirely inappropriate. If the member wants to talk about the rules of the House, it is an allegation against the Attorney General which has no place.

I would just say to the honourable member that we have done what I think in the circumstances is the fairest thing. The decisions made by the Attorney General have been totally independent of the political process, and to suggest otherwise is completely unfair in the circumstances.

1500

Mr Harris: The Premier will recall that when he was in opposition, when these matters came up of whether the Premier was doing the right thing or not, whether he felt he was covering things up or not, or whether we felt it was being thoroughly investigated or not, he, his party, called for these matters to be sent to a legislative committee. I think that was the case with the member for Oriole, I think that was the case with René Fontaine. I can tell the House that the last major bell-ringing incident in this House was over whether or not the matter of the Solicitor General, then Joan Smith, would be sent to a legislative committee.

The Premier felt strongly enough then that these matters should be sent there to be resolved that he participated in, and many would say led the fight, to hijack this Parliament and ring the bells. Now I am asking the Premier to

apply the same standards that he felt then were so important. Will he refer this matter to the standing committee on administration of justice so that we can have a thorough investigation?

Hon Mr Rae: If there is a higher standard than referring the matter to the RCMP and asking them to look into an incident, and if the leader of the third party says, by asking the RCMP, that somehow the Premier is involved in a coverup, what could be more ridiculous than that? Ridiculous.

The Speaker: I would just like to announce that the time for oral questions has expired.

MEMBER'S COMMENT

Hon Miss Martel: I have a point of order which I would like to raise with you at this time, Mr. Speaker: I would refer you to page 8 of our standing orders, section 23, which states very clearly: "In debate, a member shall be called to order by the Speaker if he or she"—and I would refer you to both sections (h) and (i)—"(h) makes allegations against another member" and "(i) imputes false or unavowed motives to another member."

I was hoping that the member for St George-St David would get up and withdraw the comment. We have the printout from Hansard which says very clearly—this is in the words of the member for St George-St David—"The Solicitor General is being investigated by the police because he tried to fix a ticket."

I think that is an allegation which should be withdrawn.

Mr Scott: I withdraw any impropriety that is made in those remarks. I simply draw the attention of the House and you, Mr. Speaker, to the letter from the Solicitor General which has led the Attorney General of Ontario to invite the RCMP to conduct an investigation.

Mr Wiseman: Come on, Mr Speaker. He either withdraws or he doesn't.

Mr Scott: Those are the facts, and the investigation is either into the impropriety of the act or for some other purpose.

Interjections.

The Speaker: If we are all at least a little bit relaxed, the point of order was quite properly raised by the government House leader. All members will certainly recall the practice that normally when it is raised, the member about whom the point of order is raised, has—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I do not intend to shout over other members.

Mr Scott: I said that I withdraw any impropriety.

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat, please.

Mr Scott: It is ridiculous.

The Speaker: I realize that. What I wish to draw to members' attention is the fact that when a matter is raised, the member of whom it is about has the opportunity to respond, and if it is an allegation, a simple withdrawal is

sufficient, without explanation. I take it the matter has now been resolved.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that notwithstanding standing order 94(h), the requirement for notice be waived with respect to ballot item 17.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

NURSING HOMES

Mr Brown: I have three petitions, all to the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly. They are signed by a large number of my constituents who are protesting the inadequate funding for nursing homes.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mr McLean: "It is with dismay and concern that I have learned of the recent decision of the Ontario Film Review Board to permit the unrestricted distribution of uncensored pornographic films and videos. We see this as a further step in the undermining of the moral values of our province and community and the corruption of our youth. As our local member of the Ontario Legislature, I respectfully request you to register our concern and seek to address this further deterioration of the moral fibre of our nation."

That is from the Bethel Baptist Church in Orillia.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Brown: I have a large number of petitions from constituents in the Elliot Lake area and they say:

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%; and

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

FRENCH-LANGUAGE SERVICES

Mr McLean: "To the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Whereas, the French Language Services Act, 1986, Bill 8, continues to elevate tensions and misunderstandings over language issues throughout Ontario, not only at the provincial but also at the municipal levels; and

"Whereas, the current government disputes its self-serving select committee findings, intends to encourage an increased use of French in the courts, schools and in other provincial services to ensure that Bill 8 is working well to the best of their concentrated efforts; and

"Whereas, the spiralling costs of government to the taxpayer are being forced even higher due to the duplication of departments, translations, etc, to comply not only with the written but also the unwritten intent of Bill 8; and

"Whereas, the spiralling costs of education to the taxpayers are being forced even higher due to the demands of yet another board of education—French-language school board,

"We, the undersigned, request that Bill 8 be repealed, its artificial structures dismantled immediately, and English be declared as the official language of Ontario in government, institutions and services."

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr Runciman from the standing committee on government agencies presented the seventh report of the committee and moved its adoption.

Motion agreed to.

1510

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ACCESS TO COURTS ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR L'ACCÈS AUX TRIBUNAUX

Mr Scott moved first reading of Bill 77, An Act respecting Access to the Courts.

M. Scott propose la première lecture du projet de loi 77, Loi concernant l'accès aux tribunaux.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Mr Scott: The purpose of this bill is to amend the access to justice act by altering what is called the law of standing which permits the category of people who can sue in litigation in our courts. The bill essentially implements a recent recommendation made by the Ontario Law Reform Commission.

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
AMENDMENT ACT, 1991LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE MINISTÈRE
DES COLLÈGES ET UNIVERSITÉS

Mr Perruzza moved first reading of Bill 78, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act to

require the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council for transactions respecting university lands

M. Perruzza propose la première lecture du projet de loi 78, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur le ministère des Collèges et Universités en vue d'exiger l'approbation du lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil pour les opérations relatives à des biens-fonds des universités.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Mr Perruzza: This bill would require universities, before they engage in disposition of publicly acquired lands or engage in long-term leases, to ask for permission of the Lieutenant Governor in Council to be able to do that.

GASOLINE TAX AMENDMENT ACT
(AVIATION FUEL), 1991LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI DE LA TAXE SUR
L'ESSENCE (CARBURANT AVIATION)

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 79, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act in respect of Liability for Tax on Transfers of Gasoline, Aviation Fuel or Propane.

Mme Wark-Martyn propose la première lecture du projet de loi 79, Loi portant modification de la Loi de la taxe sur l'essence concernant l'assujettissement à la taxe lors de transferts d'essence, de carburant aviation ou de propane.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: This bill will close the loopholes that currently allow airlines to attempt to avoid the tax on aviation fuel used to refuel their aircraft in Ontario. These amendments will result in the consistent application of tax between domestic and foreign air carriers and between aviation fuel purchased both in and out of the province, while preserving approximately \$41 million in revenue annually.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon Mr Laughren: I move government notice of motion 18.

The Speaker: The Treasurer moves government notice of motion 18.

Hon Mr Laughren: Notice of motion 18 states that the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing 1 May 1991 and ending 31 July 1991, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for St Catharines.

Mr Bradley: Thank you for the opportunity to speak in the supply debate this afternoon.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I just want to consult with the table.

I am sorry. I did not follow the procedures properly, Treasurer.

Mr Laughren moves that the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the period commencing 1 May 1991 and ending 31 July 1991, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Hon Mr Laughren: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If that is the worst you ever do to me, I shall not complain.

The members will know, although there may be some members newer to the chamber than others, that this is a tradition in which we have a very broad-ranging debate. The members might also know that while this allows us to pay the salaries of the civil servants and other expenses until 31 July, the rules actually state that it could be a six-month period. But there has been a tradition in the last number of years that it be somewhat less than six months. So this will take us through until the end of July of this year, which means, of course, we will have another one of these invigorating debates before we adjourn some time in June, I hope. I look forward to the debate this afternoon. It has traditionally been a very unrestrained debate and I look forward to hearing from the members opposite as well as those members from my own caucus who will be making a contribution to the debate.

Mr Bradley: I welcome the opportunity to participate in this free-ranging debate which deals with the government of Ontario and its business, particularly as it relates to the funds that are required for the government of Ontario. I do not want to repeat much of what I had to say yesterday, because it was a new and unique address to this Legislative Assembly where I introduced some ideas that perhaps the government has not thought of, and some it has thought of and perhaps rejected, and others that it has adopted. I must give the Treasurer credit, from time to time, when he does accept ideas from the opposition and of course takes the full credit for them, which one does in government. I certainly do not allow that to happen very often.

I want to deal with a number of issues which I think are important to my part of the province and to the entire province. The way I perhaps will relate this is that the Niagara Peninsula has some problems which are unique and some which are common to the rest of the province. Perhaps if I use specific instances from our part of the province, people would understand what everyone is facing in these difficult economic times.

I think first of all of the message that I delivered to the House this afternoon, and that was an appeal from the St Catharines and District Labour Council for some assistance for the St Catharines Unemployed Help Centre. I remember when help centres were first established. I think, if my memory is correct, a lot of these were arising from a previous recession. There were some people who were a bit sceptical at the time that they could be of assistance to people, that it would be a duplication of service for the Unemployment Insurance Commission and other agencies. I think there was a compelling case made, largely from people in the trade union movement, but others I think who had a social conscience in the community, that in fact

unemployed help centres across the province could be of some assistance.

1520

Indeed, in the kind of recession that we are facing today, with the figures that Gord Wilson, the president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, provided when he visited St Catharines recently—and he had a rather fine selection of quotes and pieces of information that he provided in a packet. It dealt largely, in this case, with the federal government and its transgressions, but certainly there were opportunities for the provincial government, as I indicated to the news media later, to act in many areas of interest.

I thought it a rather interesting gathering of people. I saw that there were people from various labour councils around the Niagara Peninsula there, and much of what Mr Wilson had to say on that occasion was certainly commendable and certainly something that we could agree with.

I am going to channel that into the provincial area this afternoon and say that I certainly agree with the St Catharines and District Labour Council and Gabe MacNally's letter that they have reason to be disappointed, that the Minister of Labour did not either indicate there was going to be additional funding available or was not prepared to provide that funding to the unemployed help centre in St Catharines as of the date of that letter being written.

I know the people who work there; I have known them for years. They have provided assistance over and above that which could be provided through the agency known as Employment and Immigration Canada, because they have counselled people individually, people who are pretty depressed when they are hit with the kind of unemployment we see today. As Gord Wilson says, we are now in a situation where about 48% of the jobs that disappear in the province of Ontario in this recession are jobs that are unlikely to return. That is different from the last recession, where about 25% to 28% of the jobs might have been jobs that would not return specifically for people at the end of that recession.

So I thought the compelling case that he had made, combined with the letter which the St Catharines and District Labour Council provided to all of the members from the Niagara Peninsula and specifically directed to the Minister of Labour, commended itself for some immediate action. I hope that as a result of my intervention in the House this afternoon, the Minister of Labour will give reconsideration, will inform the St Catharines and District Labour Council of the availability of funds and indeed will provide those funds so that it can carry out this very needed service in our community.

Those are the kinds of services that indeed are required as I look across this province. I think, to be fair, we have given a period of time now where the government has had an opportunity to act. I heard during the election campaign and previous to that, when the governing party was in opposition, much discussion about what was required in terms of the health care needs of the province of Ontario. I well remember the questions which were directed to the government of the day with some vigour, by candidates in the Niagara region and other parts of the province, outlining

the very real needs to increase and expand and enhance the health care services that are available.

There were a number of projects, which were advanced from hospitals in the Niagara region, from other health care facilities and from individuals and groups, that I think were worthy of funding. We have not seen many of those translated into action at this time. I would have thought that, particularly with the recessionary period there, this government could have a double positive impact that would be fighting for jobs in the area; that is, beginning construction and generating economic activity which would produce even other jobs, and second, of course, providing needed health care facilities.

I directed a question in the House to the then Minister of Health regarding the need for a computerized axial tomography scanner in the Niagara region, and she has indicated in her response to me that it was in fact one of many that must be considered. I appreciate the fact that the Minister of Health has to always consider all of the needs of the province of Ontario, not any specific needs. Those of us who represent specific areas of the province, it is our responsibility to draw that to the attention of ministers. So I do hope that there will be a confirmation of the approval of that CAT scan machine, because there are hundreds upon hundreds of people who simply cannot get a CAT scan done on an elective basis. There are a lot of elective cases. People say, "Well, it's elective so it's not so important." That is not the case. For instance, in some cases involving the Workers' Compensation Board, there is a need for a CAT scan machine to be utilized and that is considered to be elective rather than emergency in many of those cases. That is just one instance.

I do hope that the government will fulfil its promises, will fulfil in fact the obligations which were indicated by the previous administration. Then we can enhance health care in the province.

It is interesting to note that now that the NDP is the government, however, the new Minister of Health is talking about controlling health care expenditures. I did not hear one word of that when they were in opposition. No talk of control then, only people rising daily in the Legislative Assembly. The member for Windsor-Riverside, who was the former critic, was aggressive in pursuing issues related to health care in the province, as was his role and responsibility as a member of the opposition. Yet I hear from the new minister that in fact one of the priorities is going to be controlling health care costs.

That is going to be interesting to some of the people who perhaps felt the previous government, or the government previous to that, were not prepared to put the kind of money into the health care system. I will certainly report to those people what the new priority is.

When I look around the province of Ontario I see that there are other responsibilities. The community college in our area, Niagara College, is one which has been quite successful over the years. It is looking for funding for a St Catharines campus. The one that exists at the present time is somewhat inadequate. There is a need for a new campus and it would be nice to see the government, in its priorities

as it proceeds with its programs, have money to enhance those opportunities.

It is particularly important because we recognize that community colleges in this province are very much involved in the retraining of workers in this province. I know the concern that this government must have for the workers whom I represent and whom it represents around the province of Ontario.

There are other circumstances. The Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority is on a budget which makes it very difficult for it to carry out its responsibilities. I suspect this is the case in the Grand River Conservation Authority and virtually any across this province, that there is inadequate funding to carry out those environmental projects and other projects which are necessary to ensure that the province is a better place in which to reside. I know that the new government will want to address those very genuine needs because it used to be critical of what its members referred to as cutbacks in years gone by.

I also know that there is an opportunity—and this is a difficult question to deal with. Those of us in opposition, as when the NDP was in opposition, tend to have answers which are more instant than the government and suggestions that governments do not always implement with the degree of rapidity which we would like to see.

One of the problems that we have, for instance, in the various borders of the province—and I know the member for Sault Ste Marie has raised this in his area, and people in the Thunder Bay area and the Cornwall area and so on. One opportunity to enhance what we have to offer on the Canadian side is to provide some additional funding to the "Shop Ontario" group which, I think, had \$15,000 and would like to have more money to assist in putting forward a positive case.

It is very difficult—and certainly the Treasurer knows this, among all people—to close the gate, to say, "Well, you can't go over the border, you can't purchase anything on the other side of the border." Many people who are dependent upon Canadians buying their products for their own jobs are sometimes the people who cross the border to do that shopping as well.

We have a lot to ask. We have a lot to show for on this side of the border. Sometimes it is putting it in the most positive light that can be helpful. I hope that the government would be pleased to be able to enhance and expand upon those particular efforts to put forward the positive case for the province of Ontario.

I should raise as well the financial aid to farmers, and I know the member for St Catharines-Brock, who is here, and the member for Lincoln, who was here a moment ago, would share my views, and I have spoken in the House on this—the Minister of Agriculture and Food is here—that we have some excellent agricultural land in this province but it is going to be hard to retain that agricultural land unless farming can be made viable, unless we can put the necessary resources in the hands of farmers so that they are not forced to sell their land.

1530

I should note that even some people who are strongly supportive of the preservation of prime agricultural land

have sold off parts of their land simply out of economic necessity; not for any other reason than economic necessity. I would encourage the government, and I have said this to many other people in defence of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, if it embarks upon this kind of program, if people want to have the farm land preserved, it has to do one of two things. They have to pay higher prices for the food or they have to be prepared to accept that the government is going to provide some assistance.

Politically, if you look at any country across the world, whenever governments allow the price of food to go up there is an uproar in that country. I suspect what we are going to have to do here in the province of Ontario is have the government provide specific assistance and come up with some innovative plans to retain good agricultural land. As I have said on other occasions, it is not simply for this year and it is not simply for this generation, but it is for future generations in terms of keeping prices down and competitive in terms of international prices. We know that as soon as the products disappear from our agricultural land, we can be sure that imported product prices will go up considerably.

In addition to that, I think we have a moral obligation in the long run to feed those parts of the world, to provide the kind of agricultural products that the rest of the world could use to maintain their lives for themselves and for their children. So I encourage that, and I encourage the government to remain restrictive in the interim in terms of what it is prepared to do in terms of the Planning Act.

We all know that if you give blanket severances or approval for new boundary expansions and so on, that is the end of agricultural land. I suspect the Minister of Agriculture and Food would not easily entertain that. The Minister of the Environment, who is entering the House now, would certainly not want to see that happen and I think, by and large, most of the people in the province would not.

By the way, I should add that there has been a feeling, perhaps, in urban areas—you hear it expressed, and the Minister of Agriculture and Food knows this; he hears it expressed because he deals with people who are both from urban and rural settings—"Are those farmers ever going to be happy? They are really not in bad shape," and so on. Visit the farms in the province of Ontario, indeed right across this country, and you will see that agriculture is hurting. I hope that the Treasurer in his budget is prepared to allocate sufficient funds for the Minister of Agriculture and Food to be able to assist farmers in a meaningful way to stay on the farm.

There is another issue that is of specific regional interest to me, and that is the Niagara Regional Police inquiry. As members know, the cost of that is rather substantial; it has been a rather lengthy inquiry. I know that members of the New Democratic Party stood in this House to demand such an inquiry a number of years ago, and so I know that they will feel pangs of conscience over there in terms of providing some financial assistance to the local community to meet the obligations that are the Niagara Regional Police Commission's financial obligations in terms of the Niagara Regional Police inquiry. As this inquiry comes to an end and the government can assess all of the costs, and

what the results have been, and can remember that many of its own members called for an inquiry of the police in the Niagara region, it will be prepared to provide that kind of funding to alleviate the obligations of the local taxpayers in the Niagara region.

I touched on the issue of Falconbridge the other day because I knew that the Treasurer—I read these things. One of the things about being in the Legislature for almost 14 years is that I tend to remember some of the things that the people who are now in government said when they were in opposition. I remember not only the member for Sudbury East, who is now the government House leader, but her father who as a colourful opposition—I almost said leader because we often thought he was the opposition leader, but he was the House leader in one of the opposition parties at one time—teamed up with the member for Nickel Belt in demanding that Falconbridge refine its ore, hopefully in the Sudbury basin, but certainly in Ontario or in Canada.

When he has the opportunity to do something differently he says: "Well, the devil made me do it, and I can't do it now, you know. I can't do it now that I'm here. It is something the previous government did and we have to live up to that obligation." It is all right for him to change other rules. I had the quotes the other day. I wish I had them today, but I do not. But I had the quotes and they were perfect quotes.

Then he was going to nationalize Inco—we all remember that—because he thought that was an appropriate thing, and it was in the NDP platform. I thought that was one of the first things the new Treasurer would insist upon as a condition of sitting in the cabinet, that in fact Inco would be nationalized. What do I find? I do not like using these terms in the House, repeating them even, but I find that Pink Floyd is really Blue Floyd, that really he is not going to do those things.

Even though he is holding up a pink pen at the present time, I say to people in the province, when he has had the opportunity to be the Treasurer and to implement many of these policies, like his leader, now the Premier of this province, he has changed his mind on so many issues and changed his style so often that he just sounds like any other politician. I always thought—I really thought—he even had me convinced on the government side when he was in opposition; he even had me convinced that somehow the NDP was holier than everybody else. I really believed that at one time, and I thought that rather interesting. I wondered what would happen if they did get in power, and I find out when they assume the role of government that in fact they are the same as every other politician—not worse. I do not point and say, "They're worse than everybody else, and isn't this awful?" I simply say that they are the same as everybody else.

The member for Renfrew North was standing in the House, reading back to the Premier of this province a quotation from the Premier when he was in opposition. We could do that on a daily basis, but he has changed his mind and I suspect the Treasurer has on many issues as well.

The people in eastern Ontario who are here today—and we have members in the House from eastern Ontario who

say that they are very disappointed with what the government has done for eastern Ontario in terms of the allocation of funds and the attention paid to eastern Ontario. They recall when the previous government was in power that a lot of attention was paid to eastern Ontario, that the funds were flowing into eastern Ontario. Now, when we have a new government in power, it ignores eastern Ontario. I guess they do not have enough members there. I cannot really figure out what the reason would be.

But they were quick to do some things. I must give them credit. They move quickly when they have to move quickly. When it came to removing the oath of allegiance, they moved quickly and secretly to do so, even though in the legion—I would think in the Beamsville legion, in the Smithville legion, in all the legions across the province of Ontario, Prince Edward-Lennox, certainly in Tillsonburg—I am getting calls and letters from all over Ontario, from people who say, “You know, it was not just the fact that they were removing one of our important institutions, so important to our forefathers and foremothers and others.”

What was really galling to them was that it was done behind closed doors, and even in Niagara-on-the-Lake and Merritton—and I see the member for St Catharines-Brock here. I heard a report from the Merritton legion the other day that they were livid. Even those who had voted NDP were livid that behind the backs of the population of Ontario they removed the oath of allegiance to appease somebody—heaven knows who—in this province.

I was distributing the other day to the Premier—I gave him one of the coins, the commemorative coin from the last visit of the Queen to the province of Ontario, and I hope he treasures that. I know that I wear proudly the pin of the province of Ontario, which I think tells an awful lot about our tradition, and I know, when it is convenient, members of the government do so as well.

Whether it is Chatham, Binbrook, East Zorra township, South Dumfries, North Dumfries, Mitchell, Monkton, Fullarton, wherever it is, the people of this province are disappointed that this government has done this behind the backs of everyone, and I suspect behind the backs of the caucus. I never know those things. The brain trust that the member for Welland-Thorold talked about: I wish I could remember the name he used to describe them, the little clique of people within the Office of the Premier. There are some nice people in there, do not get me wrong. I like some of those people on a personal basis, but these people—

1540

Hon Mr Laughren: Name names. I want to hear who you like.

Mr Bradley: I will not name anybody I like because that is rather dangerous. I should use the line I used the other day in the House so I could get another laugh out of it, if I could. The Treasurer will remember that I said, “You people promised the moon, and that is one promise you delivered on.” I told my brother I would say that if he were watching television today.

Going to some of the others, I am a member of the teaching profession and I well recall the promise of this government that it would assume 60% of the cost of

education. So at the first chance they get—and the former Minister of Education is here; 4e will be interested in this—to move in the direction of assuming 60% of the cost of education, they are in full retreat. I can hear the bugle of retreat. Larry French from the Ontario Secondary School Teachers’ Federation, who is usually up in the gallery watching carefully, I know would be disappointed that they have fallen backwards instead of moving forward on that promise. I suspect when they finally do try to move in that direction, they will throw everything including the kitchen sink in and say, “See, we pay 60% of the cost of education.” I know if they do that they can find that about 58% of the cost is paid today, if you put it all in.

We know the government will not keep that promise, and I know that my friends in the Ontario Teachers’ Federation and all of its affiliates will be vociferous in calling this to its attention, as they have in years gone by; as will others.

I hope not to lose my voice. That is not something shared by members of the government, I am sure.

I would like to get into something else about the Charter of Rights. It is great when you can do this in this kind of debate. This is where it is freewheeling. I know all my colleagues agree with this when I get into this.

I must say how disappointed I was in what is referred to as the Askov decision, where it was stated that if people did not receive a trial in a certain period of time, somehow, under the Charter of Rights, they could be excused, not acquitted but the trial would be thrown out and the person would not have to live up to his or her responsibility.

Governments have tried—the Attorney General is trying and the previous Attorney General was trying—to move these. I am not one who points fingers so much at the Attorney General in this case, or previous attorneys general, as I do in this case at the Supreme Court, especially at the Supreme Court, because I think that is a wrong-headed decision on the part of the Supreme Court. I really do think it is a wrong-headed decision that it would allow this to happen.

For the member for Ottawa Centre, I hope she recognizes this, because she has been a member of this House and I think she would understand it. Maybe she is philosophically in agreement with the Supreme Court on that decision, and that is fair. I would not criticize her for taking that position. But she has to recognize, as all members of this House have to recognize, that the courts are beginning to take away the power of the legislative assemblies of Ontario and the rest of the provinces and of the federal Parliament, and I do not agree with that. Some people do agree with that, and I accept that, but I do not believe that should be the case. Therefore, I think it is unfortunate that that court should dictate what the policy of her government or any other government should be, and that is what is happening with government. The Treasurer will know this, and the Chair of Management Board will know this, that what governments can do is dictated largely by decisions of the court, and I hope all members of this Legislature know that. I know the member for Ottawa Centre is hell-bent that she is going to score some political point on this. She can do that if she wants to, but I am telling other

members of this Legislature that their powers are being eroded as a result of what has happened constitutionally.

I look at the Treasurer, and I know that what the Treasurer is facing in this province and will face for many years to come as a result of decisions of this kind is in fact a dictation of government policy. People who are really perceptive will know this. Governments will find out that their room to manoeuvre in terms of finances is confined by court decisions which dictate what they shall do—not what they ran on, but what they should do.

Therefore, I disagree strongly with that decision and other decisions of the court which force this on governments. I do not agree with that, and I really believe that elected legislatures should not be overruled by courts on those kinds of matters. It is most unfortunate.

Ms Gigantes: What's your solution? Let's hear it. We didn't get a vote on how long criminal cases should be backed up.

Mr Bradley: Well, I am going to say to the member for Ottawa Centre, she was the Minister of Health at one time. She would not be able to spend as much money as is necessary or she would like as Minister of Health if a Supreme Court is dictating that the money has got to be spent somewhere else, and if she thinks that is right, I disagree with her. I disagree vehemently, and I suspect many members of this Legislature—

Ms Gigantes: How long do you think people should wait for a trial?

The Deputy Speaker: Order. After he is through, I will say, "Questions and comments." You will have the floor then.

Mr Bradley: Anyway, I wanted to vent that particular opinion that I have. But I really think that is something that all of us who are elected will have to assess carefully and really think about carefully, how much your priorities and how much your obligations and how much your room to manoeuvre is influenced by court decisions, not only the decisions which are made, but when the Attorney General comes to those members as a cabinet or as a caucus and says to them, "If we don't do this it's going to cost \$500 million, but if we do it it'll only cost us \$350 million," it may be an area where they did not want to move at all; they have had other priorities. It may have been something a previous government was interested in and, frankly, they do not think is that important. But the court says, "You've got to do it," or the Attorney General comes to them and says, "If you don't do it it's going to cost us twice as much, or at least substantially more." Members should think about that, and I know that there is no easy solution, but it is a circumstance that they face. I know that the Treasurer and the Chair of Management Board particularly will find that out.

I wanted to look at a couple of other areas which I think are of significance, but I would like to know how much time I have taken at the present time, if I could figure that out.

Some hon members: Too much.

Mr Bradley: "Too much," say some members of the opposition. I wanted to save some time for the member for

Renfrew North. He certainly will add to me, but I wanted to touch on another matter which I think is important.

The member for Perth is here today. She disagrees with me on this, and I expect that that is going to be the case. She has disagreed with me for—she does not want me to say how many years—a number of years or something like that. She is also originally from St Catharines, and I want to report to her that I will get her the special edition. The centennial edition of the St Catharines Standard came out last Sunday, 100th anniversary. It is a wonderful package put together and I will personally get her a copy of that so she will be aware of some of the happenings in the Niagara Peninsula.

She sits with me on the government agencies committee, and I know she disagrees with this, and we have exchanged views. I will not say we have fought on this, we have exchanged views on this many times, and that is the appointments process in the province of Ontario.

There is a major gap between the perception and the reality. The perception which the government attempted to set out—and I might say with a good deal of success. As a politician, you admire it when the other side is with some success able to get its message across. I do not think it is accurate. I will not say it is misleading, that is against the rules of the House, and I do not even want to say it is misleading anyway. I just think it is inaccurate to say that there has been a drastic change in the appointments system.

1550

What has happened, which I think is positive, is that people being appointed do appear before the committee, and it is a limited amount of time and so on, and there is a limited number of people who can appear, but I think that is rather interesting. However, the committee does not have the power, despite what I have read in some places, to reject.

I see that the member for Lincoln has absconded with something. I will not elaborate on that, but in midstream he has distracted me. Where was I?

It was here on the perception and reality, and the perception is that the government has made a drastic change, that somehow the Premier has depoliticized the appointments system in the province of Ontario. Well, it has not happened.

I do not mind that the government makes those appointments. When you win the election—and I am not going to play the game of, why do we not have proportional representation, now that it is convenient to me. I am not going to do that. The rules were the rules. When the election is called, you win by the rules, you win, and that is it, you have the responsibility, congratulations. And if you make your appointments—and you consult the opposition once in a while; you may consult others, that is fine—you can make those appointments; that is your prerogative. The opposition will say, "Isn't it awful? All these New Democrats are being appointed," and so on. Some people might say yes, some people would say, "No, it's their turn, and they can be appointed if they see fit."

What is happening is that in fact the committee does not have the right to reject. The committee cannot reject. It can vote against, but the Premier and the Premier's office

do not have to pay any attention. The group that the member for Welland-Thorold made reference to does not have to pay any attention. Besides, it will be a frosty Sunday in July when the government members vote to reject an appointment made by the Premier of this province. I would be one of the most surprised people in the committee if that were to happen. So the committee does not have the right to reject or to veto the appointments put forward by the Premier and his advisers.

Second, we cannot as a committee call any independent witnesses forward. For instance, there may be a person put forward for the position of—and I see today the chair of Hydro has been announced. It did not come to the committee first, by the way, to say, “What do you think of this?” It is announced and then it goes to committee and you are supposed to get the rubber stamp out and put the rubber stamp on.

There may be justification for having someone come forward, maybe Energy Probe, for instance, before the committee and say, “This is why we think this is either a good choice or a bad choice.” Does the committee have that right? No, it does not, or to accept written representations in a formal way; the committee does not have that power to accept those. That is a distinct disadvantage.

I do say, in fairness to the person proposed for the position by the Premier’s office, that in fact that person should have the right to respond in any way to those. There is no question about that. They should have the right to respond.

But there is no provision for third-party intervention in this case. That would very much help the committee. In some cases it would take the wind out of the sails of the committee, opposition members, for instance, who think that, “Here’s a person who has a long NDP background and the only reason they’re getting it is because they’re NDPers.”

I will tell members something. If we had some independent third parties in there saying, “We don’t care about that part of it, but we think this person is particularly competent,” it would peel away some of the arguments that the opposition would have, I think with some justification. The time is too limited that we have to deal with that as well.

In addition to that, we cannot deal with reappointments. For the life of me, I do not know why the government members would not want to deal with reappointments, because they were appointed by Liberal and Conservative governments. I would sure as heck, if I were a government backbencher, want to be there, able to get at some of those people, and yet they do not have that opportunity as well.

There are other problems as well. We do not have the ability as a committee to deal with all order-in-council appointments. We tried to get a list one day of all the order-in-council appointments that are made by the government and then, a second category, all those that would not come to the committee. We could not get the list. It was going to be delayed.

The government NDP members in committee, I have noted, act just the way Liberal and Conservative government committee members did years ago. They do the bidding

on the instruction of their chief government whip. I am not critical of that. Do not get me wrong; I am not critical of that. I am simply saying, do not pretend it is different. It is not different.

I had hoped to speak about 25 minutes in the House this afternoon. I should have had a watch in front of me to see what it was. Members of the opposition cannot wait for me to sit down. The member for Lincoln has sent over something that—

Mr White: We are the government now, Jim.

Mr Bradley: Yes, the government; sorry. It is hard to come to that conclusion, even though I spent eight and a half years previously in opposition, and what fun it was then, just as what fun it is now, because there is a different perspective.

By the way, I said when I was in government, and some of my friends in the Legislature will know that I said when I was in government, and I say it today, that the role of the opposition is extremely important. I remember when I was in cabinet, the member for Renfrew North and I who sit in the House today were members of a cabinet and had served in opposition, the member for Renfrew North even longer than I, and the reaction of those in cabinet who had never been in the Legislature before to the yammering of the opposition, as compared to those who had served before in opposition, was substantially different. I always recognized that, even though I was angry as could be at some of the people on some days in opposition, that was their role, and if they were not performing that role, then democracy would not be the beneficiary.

The member for Lincoln has sent across something that is designed to have me sit down. He has tantalized me with a chocolate bar this afternoon, and I guess that is the kind of bribe that probably will make certain that I do not continue this afternoon. But I have enjoyed the opportunity to make this intervention this afternoon on behalf of, I hope, the people of the province of Ontario and to encourage some debate on issues that I think are important to our province.

Mrs Haslam: As the member for St Catharines has indicated, we do sit on the same committee, and I do take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House some discrepancies in the way he looks at the committee and the way I look at the committee, and I do appreciate this opportunity.

He mentioned that when we are looking at people who come before this committee, they are all New Democrats. I would like to point out that there are many more non-New Democrats than there are New Democrats. In the first few times that we had people come in to us, the first question that opposition members often asked was, “Do you have a party affiliation?” and the answer was no. If it was not, it was usually, “Well, yes, I’ve contributed to the Liberal” or “I’ve contributed to the NDP.”

For instance, Andy Brandt came forward and I took the opportunity to ask him if he was a member of a political party, and he was very upfront and said, “Yes, I am,” and I said, “Which party are you a member of?” He told me, and he actually indicated how much he had donated to the

party. His comment was, "Much more than I can afford to donate to the party." But I did want to draw that point out.

The openness in the process, as I see, for this particular committee is the knowledge by people out there that there are these binders of agencies, boards and commissions available, that they can go into a constituency office, that they can go into a library, that they can go into a municipal office, that they can find out where these boards, agencies and commissions are indicated and what their criteria are to serve on them. The one that one of the members mentioned was the red goatmeat commission, and that one just really amazed me—we have many agricultural commissions—and I think it is important that the people in the riding of Perth know what these agencies, boards and commissions are all about and have the opportunity to know how to get on them.

I can see that my time is running out, and so in the words of the member for Mississauga West, the bottom line is that in the process of re-examining all of these procedures we appreciate that.

Ms Gigantes: I would just like to comment very briefly on the statements that were made by the member from St Catharines concerning the backlog in the courts. Whether one agrees with him about the role of the judiciary and the judicial system in determining how we make decisions in a democratic system or not, I think he would have, in fairness, to acknowledge that there was a backlog in the courts of Ontario when this government assumed responsibility in the fall of last year which was absolutely irresponsible.

The backlog was enormous. The length of time for which people were being expected to wait for a trial and disposition of the charges against them was intolerable. I think that he speaks to this matter to try to cover up the fact that the former Attorney General, who had plenty of warning on this subject, really had quite irresponsibly ignored it, and that over many years. I remember well this issue being raised in 1985 in this Legislature and the Attorney General assuring us there was no problem.

I also find it quite galling that he speaks on this matter from the point of view he does, while the member for York Centre will frequently shout from the opposition bench that this government is responsible for the fact that the courts have determined that people must be brought to trial in a reasonable length of time, that this government is responsible when tens of thousands of cases have been dismissed. Responsibility lies with the former Attorney General, as the member for St Catharines well knows.

1600

Mr Sutherland: I just wanted to make a few comments with regard to what the member for St Catharines said, particularly about the role of the opposition. He was highlighting how he felt when he was in cabinet that the role of opposition was extremely important in terms of the democratic process and in terms of keeping governments accountable. I want to agree with him on the statement that it certainly is a very important role.

However, I also want to compliment him on his speech for talking about some real issues that affect the people in

his riding, talking about unemployment issues and other issues that were of concern. I just hope, after what we have heard the last couple of days in question period, that more members within his caucus and within the opposition will start talking about the real issues affecting the people of this province of Ontario rather than trying to make news headlines and get sound bytes. I think the people of Ontario will be much better served if there are more opposition members talking about those specific issues that the member for St Catharines was bringing up this afternoon.

Mr Phillips: I would like to compliment the member on his comments and to reinforce what he was saying about employment, and that is, we are looking very much forward to the government coming forward with some employment creation ideas, as the member pointed out and gave one specific recommendation in his remarks.

Every single day the province is losing 1,600 jobs. It is an enormous legacy that the government is leaving to this province. We now have more people unemployed in Ontario than at any time in the last 50 years. We have not heard one recommendation to create permanent jobs out of this government—\$700 million, yes, for 10,000 jobs for a year. We lose that many jobs in a week in the province.

Believe me, we are looking to this government, and I hope the budget on Monday will be the litmus test for the budget, will be a job creation budget. Every single one of the members, myself included, go back to our ridings and never before, at least in the last 50 years, have we seen so many people suffering so much in this province through unemployment.

I have not heard one announcement, not one announcement in this Legislature, to create permanent jobs in this province. The Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology has not made one single statement in the House that will create permanent jobs in the province.

I am getting angry about this because we have now waited six months. We have had not one single recommendation, nothing. We will be evaluating the budget on Monday in terms of job creation, because let me warn all the members opposite that they are going to live with this legacy for four years and then the people of Ontario will have a chance to speak, and they will speak loud and clear.

Mr Bradley: Two minutes is a limited amount of time to respond, but I will attempt to do so very briefly.

I would say to the member for Perth, who had an interesting intervention, that in fact what will happen with her government is it will have the odd Liberal and Conservative, the token Liberal and Conservative, come before the committee, particularly early so it does not look like it is partisan.

They will find the overwhelming number of people that they appoint in fact are NDP or NDP sympathizers, and I am not being critical of that. They are the government, and I do not expect that they are going to be appointing to agencies, boards and commissions people who have exactly the opposite point of view or philosophy to the government. I expect that they will be appointing people of ability. I expect that from time to time there may be people from other parties who they appoint, but that the

overwhelming majority will continue to be from the New Democratic Party.

To the member for Oxford, I would simply say to him he should look at Hansard. Hansard is very useful. I used to get Hansard even before I was in the Legislature, the federal and provincial Hansard. People think it is boring reading, but it is not. It is rather revealing reading. I think if he wants to get a better perspective on what goes on in the House—and it is difficult; it is a very confrontational place. Even though you might think we enjoy it, many of us do not enjoy the confrontational end of things as much as you might imagine. I think the member has to look at what the NDP members had to say when they were in opposition, and playing a legitimate role, in opposition before the member is critical of others.

I remind members, by the way, that Andy Brandt was a Liberal at one time; I should tell the member for Perth. Finally, to the member for Ottawa Centre—I have found the member for Ottawa Centre, who just accused me of something, imputing some motives, to be one of the most partisan people I have ever dealt with in this Legislature and she does not deny that and she says that in directness and honesty. I think I attempted to put forward a case where governments are forced into certain circumstances by virtue of—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. The member for Oakville South.

Mr Carr: I would like to add to the debate, if I could. I was looking through some of my notes over the last week or so in anticipation of the budget. I was a little bit surprised, being a new member, to find out that there is a bit of an anniversary today. A year ago today was the day the previous budget was introduced, 24 April 1990.

I was a little bit surprised. I thought I was seeing things when I read the communiqué, but it was interesting, as I read it. The headlines were from the communiqué that came out from the Treasurer of the day, the now Leader of the Official Opposition. It was an interesting headline. It said, "Ontario balances budget," and it said in the subheading there, "This year Ontario will have no deficit and we will achieve a surplus of \$30 million." The surplus was going to be \$30 million. One year later, we have gone from a \$30-million surplus—one year to the day—to a \$3-billion deficit. As we sit here, we wonder why people are cynical about politicians. In a year, we have gone from a surplus to a \$3-billion debt.

I looked through some of the statistics that were in some of the books that were released as a result of that and they show very clearly the accumulated deficit. They went back all the years, from 1981 all the way through to the present budget plan and when you look at it, everything continually went up. The total debt per capita kept growing and growing year by year. The amount of spending went up year by year. In fact, I guess the last government was attempting to show what a great job it was doing. They put it very simply in charts, all the increases in spending. They put it in charts. The increased spending kept going up and up, but when you look at the critical areas, health care, we actually ended up worse off.

When that previous government came in, we had a fine health care system. At the end, we had waiting lists. When you look at education, they talk about all the increases in spending that went into education and yet versus the rest of the world, we declined over the period of time when they were in government. When it comes to the environment, they talk about the increase in the spending, pages and pages about the increase and the amount that was spent and how they spent more and more.

I am not all that old and I can remember the day when you could swim in the Humber River. In fact, my kids cannot even swim in Lake Ontario today. Even when it comes to the environment, we spent more and more and things got worse and worse. Then we wonder why the public out there is a little bit cynical and a little bit sceptical about politicians. They have reason to believe it because here we are with a document praising what fine financial shape we are in and then one year later, as I guess has been said by all three parties, we have a tremendous economic problem in this province.

1610

I will reflect a little bit on where it all went. I think it is important for all the members to take a look at this. This was the Treasurer's quarterly report that went out. When you look at it, there was a dramatic drop in revenue. As I reflect on where it is, it lays it out very clearly. It is very simple. You do not have to be a mathematician or an accountant to read it. It lays it out: One side is revenue; one side is expenditures.

On the personal income tax side we actually had a little bit more this year, almost \$1 billion more that came in than was anticipated. I guess that was a result of some of the money that comes back from the federal government through the personal income tax. But the retail sales tax is down \$672 million. Corporations: The amount they contributed—projections—was down \$775 million. The gasoline taxes are down. The fuel taxes are down. The land transfer taxes were down. Everything is down, virtually, from what the projections were. The reason they are down is because economic activity has stopped in this province.

When you look at the corresponding side, the expenditure side, you see expenditures are up: Community and Social Services, almost \$0.5 billion more; the reason, of course, is because more people are out of jobs and are now collecting social assistance. So that is up dramatically. You look down and there are some capital accounts that are up by \$389 million, and then the guarantee for the UTDC that is thrown in there as a result of it.

What we have in this province, over one year, to the day, is projections that were totally useless, completely off the mark, by the previous government and completely wrong when it came to expenditures and to revenue. Everything was off, completely off the mark.

We had the famous change in government. We now have a socialist government that has taken over. I was reflecting on an article by Terence Corcoran and this is what he said: "Ontario's socialist government, rejected by 62% of the voters last September, is moving ahead smartly in what appears to be a revolutionary approach to managing the province's economy: government by moratorium.

A moratorium is an authorized suspension or deferment of action, a strategy the economically befuddled New Democrats have applied to several sectors over the past few months."

I think that says it all. We are sitting here with the mentality of a government where all it continues to do is to complain and blame the next guy. I think that is what has added to the cynicism out there. On the one hand you have a government that is completely wrong about its projections; a year later you go from a \$30-million surplus to a \$3-billion deficit, and it might even be worse. The Treasurer will let us know what it will be in the budget. So here we are. We have a complete and absolute lack, on the part of the public, of any confidence in what they do. They legitimately have to have some concerns because we are so far off the mark continually in the way we are talking about it.

As I went through some of my notes and pulled some of the things out, I looked at what Ontario's major small-business concerns are. These are the people who generate the economic activity to generate the revenue. These are the people who generate the revenue that produces all the funds for the Education minister and for the Community and Social Services minister. We should be listening very clearly, because when you look at it, this is where the revenue is coming from. This is what pays for it.

There are two groups that basically pay for it. The one group, of course, is the personal income tax, and those people have spoken very clearly. They spoke in a poll we commissioned, which I talked about briefly yesterday, where 81% of the people said our taxes were too high. The people generating—we will round it off a little bit—the close to \$16 billion that comes through the personal income tax, the people out there are saying our taxes are too high.

On the other side of the coin, we have a lot of faxes back there.

Hon Mr Laughren: Oh, that's gross.

Mr Carr: The Treasurer is talking about the fax. I think we were very kind. Actually, in the picture of him he looks very well, and the caption is: "Do you know this man? You should, because sooner or later his hands will end up in your pocket."

We have asked people to fax us if they are concerned about taxes. The fax number is 325-9902. In spite of the fact that the picture looks very good, the people of the province have spoken: 81% are against the tax increases. As I said before, the big problem is that it is not only Conservatives, it is not only Liberals, it is New Democrats who are saying that as well. It is everybody. When you get to 81%, everybody is saying it. Every political affiliation and every group is saying, "There's no way you can tax us any more."

That is on the biggest line item, on the taxation revenue. That is from the people.

When the Canadian Federation of Independent Business commissioned a poll, when it asked, for those who responded the big concern was the total tax burden. The second factor was the government regulation and paper

burden. The third was the cost of the municipal government, and actually way down below there was the availability of financing.

So what the small businesses in this province are saying is that the number one problem they are facing is not the availability of financing through high interest rates, it is the total tax burden that they face in this province. Second, it is the government regulation.

I would encourage the Treasurer, as he reflects on his budget, to take those things into consideration. When taking a look at who is generating the revenue, let's take a moment to listen to what they have to say. Let's take a moment to listen to what the two people on the top of the revenue line are saying—the personal income tax, the people of this province that pay close to \$15 billion, and also the corporations. They are saying that there is no more to be had.

So I take a look at some of the statistics and go through the summaries that came in through the budget process, which was a good process, where we went through and took a look at all the interest groups. It said, "Government should create an environment in which business can thrive without government handouts and bureaucratic encumbrances," and that was part of the whole process.

For the members of this Legislature who did not get a chance to sit on that committee, it is very interesting, the pre-budget consultation summary produced by the research department. It is very interesting reading and I am sure the Treasurer has had a chance to look at it. If you do look at it, you see very clearly what the people of this province are saying. When you go through what they talk about, they talk about the deficit, they talk about competitiveness, they talk about taxation, they talk about social services, skills training—everything you would want to know about a province is in here from the groups that have been affected. If they read nothing else, I say to the members, take a look at this. Because at the end of the day, that is how it is going to be judged.

The ironic thing is that when the report came out, the first line of recommendations of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs said, "The committee is disturbed by the lack of adequate levels of social assistance benefits to those in need."

Actually, I went a little bit further. I did not just read the summaries in this report; I actually read the briefs. They are quite literally piled on my desk to almost my height. There were a tremendous amount.

Hon Mr Laughren: To my height.

Mr Carr: The Treasurer's height. But the problem is, and the facts of the matter are that when you look at those submissions, that is not what the first line of the recommendation should say, because that is not what the vast majority of people said. Again, we get back to why people are cynical about politicians.

Here we have a process where you have stacks and stacks of material that comes in before the finance and economics committee, and then it is totally disregarded by the people who were sitting there and listening to the process. Then we wonder why the people get cynical about

the process. That is why they get cynical, because they tell the politicians over and over again: "This is what we would like to see." Then they come out with this report which is their own personal agenda of what they would like to see; not what the people said, which is what the process is supposed to be. They came out with their own personal agenda of what they would like to see.

So if they want to get some credibility back into the process with politicians, let's start listening to what they say. Let's start listening to the 81% who say the tax burden is too high.

I want to take just a quick moment to talk about the difference between this recession and the previous recession.

In the previous recession, Ontario fared better than any other province. When we look at it, Ontario in the 1981-82 recession was better than any other province. It fared better than Quebec, British Columbia, Alberta, all the other provinces. We did better. Now when we look at it, Ontario is worse. In fact, in the statistics that are laid out there, we see very clearly that Alberta and British Columbia actually had a net increase in jobs. That group has the same federal government, has the same policies from the federal government, and yet they actually increased the number of jobs that were created.

Ontario fared worse than any other province. So we have to sit back and ask why. Why were we the worst province of any of the provinces? We have the same federal government for all 10 provinces. What did we do that the other provinces avoided doing?

1620

When we look, the big problem is that we tried to tax and spend our way to prosperity. Instead of generating economic activity and creating jobs, all we did was attempt to say: "We spent more." At the end of the day, we are not going to be judged on how much we spent; we are going to be judged on results. And unless and until we can get results which increase the economic activity in this province, the statistics are going to get worse and worse and worse. When we look at the revenue, which is declining rapidly, from the financial statements, unless we can generate economic activity in this province and start creating jobs, it is just going to get worse and worse.

A report that came out, again from the Canadian Federation of Independent Business—these are small groups; these are not the large multinationals. These are the small operations that employ the vast majority of people in this province. They are small companies of people who have mortgaged their futures to try to get a business off the ground. And when they talk about where some of the concerns are, they focus on the high taxation in this province. It is kind of ironic that we stand up here today, when literally one year ago we had a budget that was introduced that is so far wrong and so far off the mark from the realities of today.

As I mentioned, there are only two things we can do right now. We have these problems, and we can either try to increase taxes—I think everybody agrees that cannot be done—or we can cut back spending. I do not think the other side is prepared to do that. Some alternatives have been proposed by our party in terms of limiting the wages

in the public sector to help alleviate some of the problems. Those have been rejected, so the only other thing we can do is to run up the deficit in this province.

I related yesterday, and I think it is important for those members who were not there, what the debt servicing costs are in this province. I know the Treasurer knows these figures because they are surely giving him some sleepless nights. The interest charges alone in this province are \$4.3 billion, and we are looking at almost \$12 million a day in interest charges alone. That is why we have a problem. As I related yesterday, the big problem is that when deficits get out of control and get ahead of you, they take years and years before they start to come down.

I know some of the members opposite said: "Well, we don't have too bad a debt here. The problem isn't too bad, so we can afford to run it up a little bit." Well, what I say to them is that when they are paying interest charges of this high a percentage, it is already too high, and we cannot afford to run up the deficit any longer or any more in this province.

I was interested to take a look at some of the economic statements and to compare them. It was interesting reading to compare what happened in the budget of last year versus the economic statement in December. I will tell members that we are so far off the mark. My big fear is that the same group that was a part of putting together this previous budget, other than the Treasurer, will be the ones who are going to put together our new budget, and when they are that far off the mark, we have to be very, very wary.

I think what we need to do is be a little bit more conservative in our approach and not try to be too optimistic. What happens with these budgets is that we send them out in glossy, beautiful presentations; they put any annual report to shame. But the fact is, that is all they are. The only good thing about this last budget is the nice picture of the Ontario flower on the front. That is the only thing that is worth while, because they are completely off the mark. All the time and effort that went into the pages and pages of statistics—the only problem is the statistics were all wrong. They are way off the mark. We have high charts talking about how we were going to spend, and they went right off the mark because we spent more time trying to project what was happening than trying to make sure that there is economic prosperity by trying to create jobs.

Unfortunately that is a problem we are at today. It is just a bit of a difference in philosophy. As I have said before, we may debate and complain to each other, but we are really here for the same reasons. We are all fighting for the people of this province, but we are coming at it from different angles. It really comes back to something that I think was said in the throne speech, when the Premier, because it was no doubt his throne speech, said that what we need to do is create more wealth in this province—not redistribute it, create more wealth. I could not agree with him more. Unfortunately, the big problem is that the actions often speak louder than the words, and what we have done is not to attempt to create any more wealth in this province, to take a look at what the business community is saying and what people are saying to try and work with them, to try to ensure that we have economic prosperity.

What we have tried to do is throw up our hands with the wage protection fund and say: "We're not going to give people jobs. All we're going to do is make sure that we've got this big whack of money in social assistance, because we all know they're going to go on to that. And we're going to make sure that we don't put any money into training and apprenticeship and skills training to make sure these people have the jobs. We're just going to say that when they come out of work, we're going to have the money that's available."

So, as I have said many times, we are now looking at it. The line has been drawn in the sand. This government has been able to say it was the past government's fault and it is the federal government's. Starting Monday, that is not going to be the case. Starting Monday, it is going to be the Treasurer's deficit. It is going to be his taxes. The line has been drawn and we are going to be judging them year by year, day by day, and I hope the members opposite will see what our responsibility will be, to keep reminding them day in and day out of where we started when this government took over. And the people ultimately in the end will judge where they are.

As we sit here, the one last thing I would like to just sum up, if I could, is that it is an important function to look at the economy and finance, because those are the critical factors out here. So we may have come in with all of our prejudices on certain issues, but what we need to do is take a look at economic prosperity, because that is what will give us the money to ensure the social programs and the education and the environment remain sound in this province.

Mr White: I believe that my friend from Oakville South is very genuine when he says that what we should be looking at is a vibrant and lively economy which can alone sustain the kind of social goods that we want for all the people of Ontario. I believe him when he says that we are all elected and we are all dedicated to fighting for the people of our province, but I would like to bring to his attention a slight point in regard to the mention he made of how Ontario has fared worst under the free trade act, under the federal government, under the high-dollar deal that Mr Wilson may well have made with the federal Americans. I would like to point out that Ontario is, surprisingly enough, an industrial province with a large amount of industry that has been lost due to that deal. That is why we have fared worst.

I know in my riding we have had industries that have been there for generations that have lost, that have gone south, industries like Cobi Foods; Harvard Industries, which is an auto parts manufacturer; Industrial Glove and Garment. All those companies were lost due to the free trade and the high-dollar deal that the federal government made. I think that is why we fared worst, not because of the previous government's monetary policies or our own policies in our budget, and I think that what he should be looking at is another kind of a fax, a fax that says: "Do you wish to be associated with the federal Conservative Party or not? Should we disassociate ourselves, as the Albertans have, who have not fared so poorly?" That might be a

good way to fight for the people of Ontario and stay a Tory.

Mr Phillips: I, too, want to comment on the remarks by the member and say I appreciate his thoughtful comments on the budget and the estimates. Just to remind ourselves, there are five years for which we know the facts: 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and 1989. They are closed. Those were the five years where my friend, the former Treasurer—

1630

Hon Mr Laughren: Former friend, you mean.

Mr Phillips: Current friend, former Treasurer. Every single year in those five years the deficit was reduced to where there was in the final year truly a surplus. Every single year there were at least 120,000 new jobs created in the province. Every single day in the province there were 300 jobs created.

What are we seeing now? Again, every single day, not 300 jobs created; 1,600 jobs gone. We are seeing, instead of a surplus, a deficit of \$3 billion. The Treasurer may say, "Well, that's the responsibility of the federal government, the previous government," but it is a \$3-billion deficit. Last year there was a surplus; now a deficit. On Monday we may very well see a deficit even above that, perhaps \$4 billion, perhaps \$4.5 billion. But the points I would make are: the previous government, 300 jobs created every single day; a surplus in the budget. Now we are seeing every single day 1,600 jobs gone.

I think all of us in this House would acknowledge that Ontario is faring the worst. Seventy per cent of all the job losses in all of Canada are right here in this province. We are looking on Monday for the Treasurer to come forward with a budget that will create jobs; not temporary jobs, not jobs for one year, but permanent, quality jobs, instead of losing 1,600 jobs every single day.

Mr Turnbull: Just a few comments on the excellent address that my colleague the member for Oakville South made. He started talking first of all about the so-called budget of last year. Now, we all know how erroneous that document was, and indeed the electorate of Ontario was supposed to swallow the myths in that budget, of balance and of paying down the debt. We know what an illusory thing that was. It was as illusory as the Agenda for People was. We really have strained the credulity of the electorate beyond belief, because we should, as legislators, put forward documents that have some contact with reality.

We see that we have come from one Liberal administration that added \$10 billion to the debt during the best five years that this province has known in the last 50, at a time when they were raising taxes, and now we say to the Treasurer: "Please, next week, don't do the same thing to us. Don't raise the debt. Don't raise taxes. Get wise."

We really have a serious problem in this province. It is a problem of competitiveness and it cannot be solved by heaping debt on to our children. It certainly cannot be solved by fooling people with supposed balanced budgets. We have to get down to the fact that if we want to spend, we have to tax, but people are being taxed to death. They

cannot be taxed any more. So no more tax increases and no more debts.

Mr Hayes: We hear all these comments about the great way the previous government had surpluses, and there is a simple reason for that: It unloaded on the municipalities across this province. We get members up in this Legislature talking about losing jobs. There were lots of jobs lost in 1987 before this government took power, and Standard Tube in my riding, in Blenheim, is a good example.

I can tell members another thing that the Conservatives do not like, because of their cousins in Ottawa. I will use the example of Hunt Wesson Foods down in Tilbury. I called up the president of that corporation and asked if there was anything we could do to try to keep them in operation, to protect the farmers and protect the growers.

Mr Mahoney: And he said, "I am sorry; who is calling?"

Mr Hayes: He knew very well who was calling.

There were three main reasons that person told me why they were leaving, and they were: free trade—which the Liberals also supported in 1987-88; they tried to pretend that they did not—interest rates and the inflated Canadian dollar. Those are some of the key issues, and I am sure with the Treasurer—

Mr Mahoney: What about the GST? Did he like that? The one you supported.

Mr Hayes: And the GST on top of that.

A lot of the Liberal members in 1987 stated that as long as it did not hurt agriculture, for example, they did not have a real problem with it. These are some of the statements they made. I will tell members that it devastated agriculture in this province and this country.

We have a lot of faith in our good Treasurer here today.

Mr Carr: Just to reply very briefly to that, I referred to the document. I see the former Treasurer is back. When they talk about the deficit, the brackets mean deficits. In 1985-86, it was—what?—\$2.6 billion; 1986-87, it was \$2.6 billion; 1987-88, it was \$2.4 billion; 1988-89, it was \$1.4 billion; and then during the period they said there was going to be a \$30-million surplus, and that went to—what?—\$3 Billion.

Mr Nixon: You missed one.

Mr Carr: Yes, that is the interim one. There is an interim one. We have got 1988-89. So I know these documents. But the big thing, when you look at it, is the fact that it was not just the deficit, because during that period of time, between 1984 and 1990, this country had the largest percentage increase of all the industrialized nations, with the exception of Japan. Japan, as a percentage, had a faster growth rate. Guess what? The funny thing was, it was the same federal government that is there today. The facts are, versus the United States, it did a better job versus West Germany and France. So during this period of time when we had the growth, the deficits went up, the taxes went up, and in the end I guess we ended up with 132% increase in taxes. The deficit still went up, and they try to claim to have done a good job.

I know it is difficult. I know the Treasurer was probably one of the few ones who was trying to hold the line.

But none the less, there it is in black and white, and that is going to be the legacy of the previous government. That is why, in my riding, they did not win, because they taxed us to death, the deficit went up, and ultimately the services of health care, the environment and education got worse.

I was very pleased to participate in this debate today.

Mr Christopherson: I appreciate the opportunity to rise today and talk on this interim supply motion. I notice that the previous speaker spent a fair bit of his time talking about the budget of the last government and about what that meant and how that should be interpreted. If I have learned nothing else from being the parliamentary assistant to the Treasurer, it is an attempt always in this place to be fairminded.

I think, in a spirit of fairmindedness, it needs to be said by someone from the government side that the \$23-million surplus that became a \$3-billion deficit after we took office was, quite frankly, unexpected. No one was forecasting it would take place. I say that having sat in as a member of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, which did pre-budget consultations, but also in representing the Treasurer at a number of other meetings, where there were presentations by many sections of our economy. Consistently they expressed, both in those private sessions and at the public sessions, the same message: that no one was expecting this recession to be as deep and as wide and as far-reaching as it indeed has become.

I think, in the interests of fairness, it needs to be said that this is not the fault of the previous government. We may have a number of disagreements with the way that they managed the affairs and a number of concerns with where their priorities were, but any suggestion that there was incompetence or deceit on the part of the previous government and its staff we reject. I think that needs to be said strongly in response to the suggestion from the third party of something different each and every time.

1640

Second, another speaker talked about the fact that, as far as he was concerned, we are just like every other government that got elected—lo and behold, when the socialists of Ontario took office, the radical changes they expected did not happen—and that we are absolutely no different from any other government. Obviously I am going to refute that position, and I think that one need look no further than the response of both the federal government and the provincial governments across the country to the recession that we face.

With one exception, the intent has been to ratchet down the fiscal policy of the provincial government at the expense of the very people who are already being hurt by this severe recession, and in the one exception, I would suggest that they are repeating a major mistake of the previous government, which is the sloughing off of financial responsibilities on to another level of government.

It is my understanding that in the province of Quebec there is a major, serious debate going on right now regarding the provincial government's position in offloading a lot of responsibilities down to the municipalities, and that ob-

viously is not the way we have gone to date, nor intend to go. So if members look, they will see that this government is very different from the other governments of this country, both provincially and nationally, and I would suggest, to wear my partisan hat, that is why they are going to see more NDP provincial governments by the time this year is out than we now have in the nation.

It needs to be said again, what kind of measures have we taken? The \$700-million anti-recession fund; the \$500 billion that was kept in the pockets of consumers by the decision of this government not to put the retail sales tax on top of the Tory GST; the wage protection fund; the \$32 million for the labour adjustment initiatives and a whole host of other issues and initiatives that are meant to provide as much buffer and as much assistance to the people of this province who are hurting during this recession as we can possibly do. We are going to see the culmination of those efforts on Monday when the Treasurer announces our first budget.

It was also mentioned by a previous member that we did not talk about managing health care costs during the election, and I think it is fair to say that any opposition party that becomes the government, particularly when it was not expected by most, is going to have to deal with a whole host of issues and a whole set of circumstances that it otherwise would not have to contend with. I do not offer that as some kind of apology or excuse, because I think we have been very forthright and upfront about what we have done, can do and feel we cannot do on the Agenda for People. But it is fair to say that there are going to be a whole host of issues over the next four years upon which not a word was spoken during the election, and I think that is probably true of any party that moves from opposition benches to government benches. So it is not unusual that we would now be addressing that issue.

On that issue, I think what is important is that our approach and our intent—and this ties in to how we have been responding to the recession—is not to merely slash and gouge a health budget by virtue of saying, “This is what needs to be done in tough economic times,” but rather we are saying that we have found a system that is not as accountable as the public probably believes it is, certainly what they would want it to be.

It is our intent to get our arms around that system to properly manage the finances of the health care system of this province so that we can take the money that is available and more money that will be put into health care and it can be put into the places that it needs to be put into, and we can have the kind of desired results that will benefit the people of this province that we want to have, rather than this continuous shovelling of money into the system and nobody being responsible for it.

I have heard some people in this place say that the members of this government are not properly trained and do not have the background to deal with the management of the economy, to deal with the management of health care budgets, to properly manage things, especially in recessionary times. I would say to the members that we are probably more qualified than anyone else right now. Take a look at the makeup of our caucus. Look at their

background. A lot of these people in the first instance are like myself, who spent a number of years on city and regional councils, who have known very well for a long time now what it is like to deal with tight money and have very critical issues pressing on you and wonder how you are going to pay for it and not have the advantage of running deficits and borrowing huge sums of money for general revenue but working within very, very tight economic restraints that are, quite frankly, decided by this level of government.

We have been there, and my colleagues that have sat on school boards have been there and they know what that is like. I would suggest that gives us the kind of qualifications needed to deal with an economy like ours at a time like this.

In addition, we have an awful lot of people whose background is from community activism. These are the people who have been dealing head on with the critical issues of the day, the real need that is out there in our communities across this great province, and they have been doing it on a shoestring. They know what it is to work 12, 14, 16 hours a day because the need is so great in their community but there is not enough money to hire the support staff needed.

I am not pointing fingers at previous governments. That would be rather silly; we are under a rather strong constraint situation ourselves. I say very clearly, and I feel strongly, that people who come from that lifestyle, from that world, who know those experiences, are very well qualified to sit in judgement of what the priorities are in this province and where the scarce resources ought to be allocated.

One of the things I would like to touch on before I close is something that I feel very, very strongly about, again because of my own background at the municipal level and, quite frankly, something that I see as a cornerstone of our ability to be successful at what we would like to do over the term of this government. That is the whole issue of partnership. There has been a lot of discussion on both sides of the House about partnership. What does it mean?

I am convinced that things like the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Committee, the Hopcroft report talking about the disentanglement issues, the whole question of transfer payments to the MUSH sector, to universities, hospital boards, school boards—these are all some of our most contentious, controversial issues. Lord knows, hardly a day goes by that the 60% funding for schools does not come up and is not thrown out there for consideration.

I believe very strongly that it is in this area of partnerships that we can make some of the most significant and important changes during the life of our government. Because having come from the local level of government, you learn very quickly that really is the front line of public service, of elected life. You also know that a lot of the quality-of-life issues are dealt with at the local level.

If we, as a provincial government—and what this party believes in and has traditionally stood for—are to achieve those goals, then I believe we have to be successful at

making those partnerships work and they have to work in such a way that lets our colleagues at the municipal level, in the schools and the school boards and all of them, properly and adequately plan for the benefit of their own communities, make as many decisions at the local level as possible. That includes the devolution of health care decisions and social services decisions and community planning. I think that our ability to foster that relationship and to make a real difference there is one of the areas I will certainly judge this government on when, at the end of the day, I say, "How do I feel about what we have done and where we have been?" I feel very confident from the messages I am getting from our ministers that indeed it has the kind of priority that we need.

1650

Before I close on this issue, I would go so far as to say that I think we have a unique opportunity and indeed perhaps no alternative but to work very closely with business and labour and talk about how we, as an economy, are going to survive in the new world, the new structure, the new globalization, competitiveness, how we are going to deal with that. The old ways are not going to do it. It is going to require a partnership and it is going to require a lot of trust.

I do not suggest that this is going to come easily or quickly or without a lot of proof that all the partners are coming to the table, if you will, in good faith and that the ultimate decisions that are made reflect the interests of all those who are at the table, so that at the end of the day we have an economy in this province that can compete, that can generate wealth, that can provide the kind of jobs we want. But not the way Mulroney wants to do it. There is the problem. We are not going to sell out the interest of the ordinary working person to make that happen, but rather we are going to do it in partnership with the sectors which can make the difference. I believe that commitment is something we will see happen and I am convinced that we may not have any alternative.

In closing I would say, as I have said on many occasions, the public is not going to judge this government based on the first six days, nor the first six weeks, nor the first six months. At the end of our term, they will reflect on what we said we would do, what we accomplished and why we made the decisions that we did. I still remain as confident as I have from the day I entered this place that we will succeed at doing that and I look forward very much to Monday when we unveil our first major step towards that goal.

Mr Phillips: I always appreciate the member because I think sometimes the less he believes it the louder he yells it.

I just have a few comments on it. I appreciated the comments by the member where he said: "This government is going to do things differently. We're not going to do it like other governments have done and offload on the property taxpayer and offload on other levels of government."

A very solemn commitment that was made by his government was to move to 60% funding for education. I know because an awful lot of the educational community

worked with me and really hammered me on this, but the very first piece of evidence of whether the government was going to offload or not offload was its grants to the educational system. What happened? They made no move to move to 60%. In fact, the government actually decreased the amount of provincial funding for education and put more burden on the property taxpayer. There is less now for educational spending as a result of that decision by the Minister of Education than the previous government. So the very first piece of evidence of whether they are going to offload, they in fact offloaded it on the property taxpayer.

In terms of how people are evaluating and judging the government, they can only look at its actions. I quote the OSSTF because it has asked for this government to restore a much-needed level of integrity in the relationship between itself and this government as a result of the Minister of Education's pronouncements on the grants and 60% funding of education. People are watching this government. The very first piece of evidence of whether they were going to offload or not was their grants on education. They put more burden on the property tax, less funded by the province, so indeed people are watching and forming opinions.

Mr Sutherland: I would like to compliment the member for Hamilton Centre on his comments and want to pick up a little bit on his comments about the issue of partnership talking in terms of competitiveness. We have heard some members today talk about the issue of taxation and say that, if we just reduced taxes somehow, that would automatically make us competitive. While certainly everyone has got to be concerned about taxation issues and how they relate to competitiveness, they are not the only issues related to competitiveness.

I was talking with a friend yesterday who worked on a report released by the federal government that looked at the issue of competitiveness and how we did. The number one issue seemed to be a question of a skills shortage. We have not allowed people the opportunity to develop themselves and to develop their potential in skills, and that is going to make it very difficult for us to be competitive.

While we have had previous governments, certainly going back 10 or 15 years if you look at things, that would lower taxes and think that was going to solve the problem. But we never had a skills development policy 10 years ago; we never had a skills development policy 15 years ago. I think the most significant step that was taken in that way was by the previous government with its Premier's Council on skills in the global economy.

But I also want to talk about another issue of partnership, and that is in the post-secondary education system and how we have allowed a system to develop in this province where people cannot, once they complete their college education, get credit for what they have accomplished in the university system. Likewise, transferring within from university to university, frustrates a lot of individuals and discourages them from developing their full potential in skills. I certainly do hope that our minister will be able to deal with that issue and hopefully make it a much more co-operative effort.

Mr Bradley: I have a comment. I thought that the member would deal with the whole issue. I know how difficult it is when you are trying to spur economic development, but I hoped the member would deal with the issue of environmental assessment and whether this government is prepared to put aside environmental assessment for the purposes of speeding up a project. The reason I say that is the member asked a question in the House about environmental assessment, and in his supplementary he said:

"My supplementary would be first of all prefaced by thanking the minister for finally moving this assessment along. We have been waiting a long time to get this project moving. Given the fact that it did take over a year for this assessment to go through the Ministry of the Environment, what assurances can the minister give this House that the government is committed to improving the environmental assessment process?"

The conclusion I drew from this was that one of two things had happened. I realize it is an important project for the member and for members in that area, but that statement makes it appear as though the Minister of the Environment speeded up the environmental assessment process. Therefore, if that were the case, the member would want to take credit for that happening, so that the government could have the GO service at a more convenient time to him and to his constituents. If that were the case, of course, the Minister of the Environment would have broken the law. On the other hand, perhaps the process was not speeded up and the member cannot claim credit for that.

So one of the two has happened: Either, when the member asked this question on 26 March 1991, page 211 of Hansard, what he said about the environmental assessment being speeded up was not accurate or the Minister of the Environment is in trouble for speeding up that process. Knowing the minister as I do, I would be extremely surprised if indeed she would have intervened in that process to speed it along. I suspect that what the member was taking credit for in fact did not happen. I wondered why in his speech he did not address that issue.

1700

Mr White: I want to thank the member for Hamilton Centre for his excellent speech. There was one small point I wanted to pick up on following his discussion of responsibility, and that is very simply that I think there are two elements of budgetary responsibility. One is the financial accounting element of responsibility, the element that might be perceived by some financial wizard, but the other element—I think it is even more important—is the element of responsibility to all levels of government, to all the citizens of our province.

We have had situations where property tax dollars have skyrocketed. We have had the offloading that the third party has spoken of. Now I see in my area municipal taxes are not going up by more than 3%. School board taxes are not going up. Peculiar, peculiar. How is it that for years those taxes have skyrocketed and now they are not? Does this have a relationship to the moneys that have been transferred?

Mr Hope: I think so.

Mr White: I think it may indeed, and I think that the member mentioned the excellent planning in the health field, and our Community and Social Services minister, who did not offload welfare costs on the municipality.

I think at the end of four years, our responsibility will show. When the federal government introduces free trade and says that it will have help for those workers who have been dislocated, what help have they got in this province? They have a \$1-billion cut in transfer payments. We are penalized for being an industrial province. We are penalized for being the victims of free trade. What a cruel joke, and that shows no responsibility whatsoever.

Mr Christopherson: First, just to respond very briefly to the member for St Catharines, every time I have spoken he has felt that it is necessary for him to dwell on this one statement. I would just suggest to him very clearly that the day he is ready to start debating the substantive issues of the day with me instead of for ever trying to find some particular nuance to the very first question I asked in this House is the day that I am prepared to stand up and start responding to credible comments from him.

To the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, I would suggest that, again, in the first announcement of transfer payments, I think it would have, quite frankly, been irresponsible, as it would be in this first budget, for us to be stampeded into changing the entire relationship in just a few months. There is a recognition, I believe, on both sides of the House that it is one of the most complex, sophisticated funding relationships that this province has with our funding partners and that we need to be absolutely sure of what we are doing and that the desired result is exactly the one we were seeking.

I think that is why the Fair Tax Commission and the process of disentanglement discussions with our municipal partners is the right approach and the one that will lead ultimately, I believe, to a new relationship that reflects the needs of both and gives our partners much more of an opportunity to deal with the issues that they have at hand instead of for ever seeing their partner at Queen's Park being the root cause of so many of their problems.

To my other colleagues who have spoken, I thank them for their gracious comments and for adding to the points that I have tried to raise here today.

Mr Conway: There is an old parliamentary maxim that there shall be no supply without a redress of grievance, so I thought in the spirit of that tradition I might take the opportunity this afternoon to talk about a number of things that might relate to the business of the province.

I have been on the road a fair bit lately, so I have been able to reflect quite a bit about the public's business from a somewhat different perspective. I want to today talk about six or seven items in the time permitted and will be happy to welcome back my friend the Treasurer, who I know will be back very shortly.

The reason I would like him to come back is that one of the most enervating experiences of being on the road in the last couple of weeks was being on the road on a brilliant Sunday morning, I think it was a week ago last

Sunday, and to have heard Centrepont on CBC Radio's flagship program, CBC Sunday Morning. I do not know whether any of the members over there heard it, but if they did not, they ought to get the tape, because the member for Nickel Belt, the Treasurer, was featured at some length, as was the about-to-become New Democratic Premier of Saskatchewan and, as I suspect, the about-to-become New Democratic Premier of British Columbia. I quite agree with my friend the member from Hamilton Centre, I think—

Mr Nixon: Not if the people out there find out about this government.

Mr Conway: Well, I think in fairness it has to be said that the electoral prospects for the New Democratic Party in the country look quite inviting and I think nowhere more so than in Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

I have to tell members that if they did not hear the full 60 minutes of Centrepont on CBC Sunday Morning, they ought to get the tape, because listening to Mike Harcourt made me think I was listening to Frank Miller, and listening to Roy Romanow made me think I was listening to something between Mackenzie King and David Peterson, and listening to the Treasurer made me think I was listening to Bill Davis. If ever a protest movement was or is being becalmed, surely the NDP in Canada, on the basis of CBC Sunday Morning, made the point. I am just sorry that my friend the Treasurer is not here. He was so mellifluous in his compromise. I mean, he was not even a Liberal in a hurry. Pink Floyd: You have got to be kidding.

I just simply offer that as something that my friends opposite might like to listen to, that is, for those who will not be apoplectic upon hearing that Marc Eliesen, the limestone kid, is as of this afternoon the chairman designate of Ontario Hydro. It must be the Premier's way of celebrating Earth Day. Oh, I can hear the phones ringing in the Minister of the Environment's office: Marc Eliesen, chairman designate of Ontario Hydro. I am sure that somebody's research office will be on the phone to Winnipeg, and it will not be long before this place becomes a very interesting debating society as to what kind of energy future we are going to have in this province.

I have to say simply this about that. I fantasize about the struggle between the member for Peterborough, the Minister of Energy, and her servant, Marc Eliesen, chair of Ontario Hydro. There is much to excite me about that fantasy, and I know that the rank and file of the New Democratic Party are going to be very interested to see how that all plays out in the coming—

Mr Bradley: Do you think the rating agency that said there would be no loss of the triple A rating listened to Sunday Morning before they made their announcement?

Mr Conway: Well, if the rating agencies listen to Sunday Morning, I will tell the members they would rest very comfortably in their conservative pew, and if they did not find the current Treasurer of Ontario comforting, the Premier-elect of British Columbia would have made them positively ecstatic. At any rate, I do not want to spend too, too much time on that, except to say that being on the road, one hears some very interesting things.

This past weekend, I did what I have never done before and may not ever do again. I drove from Saturday morning in Pembroke to Saturday evening in Hearst and Sunday reversed the trip, some 1,700 kilometres. I was reminded of what a wonderful and magnificent land this is, but I was looking at gasoline prices, and I thought today, since no better opportunity would be presented to me—

Mr Bradley: They are monitoring them. Don't worry.

Mr Conway: I have to say that since we last discussed some of these matters, which for me was last fall—and I want to repeat that at that time I said I think this new government ought to be given at least six or seven months to develop a program consistent with its electoral manifesto. I have tried to be restrained and I will continue to do that for at least a few more days, because I think 29 April 1991 will really begin to tell the tale about the saints walking through the corridors of power, the NDP in office. I think we are still a few days away from the beginning of the really important new directions.

But I must say in the presence of my friend the member for St Catharines that it was troubling. It was almost tear-creating to read from the Minister of Energy her several responses to me and my constituents over the course of the past four or five months, when we have seen in this province gas price differentials the like of which I have never seen in 16 years as a member of this Legislature. I am not expert about very much, but I live in an automobile and I drive on a weekly basis through much of southern Ontario and quite often through a good bit of northern Ontario. Through many weeks of 19 November 1990 through April 1991, I have seen on a weekly basis, on a daily basis, as much as a 19-cent-per-litre differential between my home in Pembroke and my office in Toronto.

1710

Mr Bradley: In NDP Ontario?

Mr Conway: In NDP Ontario. I have to say that while I was not at any of the caucus meetings, members can appreciate—and I say, in the Treasurer's absence I can appreciate—the feeling of angst and unfulfilment he must have had, together with the government House leader, who for years went to church basements in Warren and Noelville and Chapleau and all those marvellous parts of the Sudbury basin decrying the want of action by other governments. And this winter, in the midst of a very serious economic downturn, I saw, and the province saw, gasoline price differentials of a truly extraordinary kind, and I got the most abject and pathetic letters from the minister, signed by her own hand, worrying about the profitability of the oil companies, and a variety of other perfectly inane observations. So, on behalf of my constituents in rural Renfrew county, who have no OC Transpo, who have no TTC, who are wholly dependent on the half-ton truck and on the automobile for transport, to say nothing of all of those people who must depend on home heating oil, I just want to say they had no protection. They got no redress from the NDP in power.

I have to ask the question, albeit rhetorically, do this Treasurer and his colleagues in the executive council ever imagine a day when they will nearly keep their commitment

to do something about gasoline prices? Let me be very clear. I do not ever expect a uniformity of gasoline prices across the province, but I do expect government to do something about alleviating a burden which this winter, in many cases, got to be as much as 70 cents a gallon, and we heard nothing but the rather pathetic observations of the Minister of Energy, which I will not bore this House with by repeating this afternoon.

My friend the member for St Catharines talked about his anxiety over the Askov case, and when he said that I must say I was reminded of being in Texas a couple of weeks ago and I was particularly struck by the news in Texas around Easter. The story there was, and I am sure it is ongoing, that the Supreme Court of that state had thrown out the education funding formula of the state and it set a very near and fixed deadline as to how and when it was to be overhauled. You have never seen a scramble like the Texas legislature running about trying desperately to meet the court order, and I gather the court order was, "If you don't do it by April 15," I think it was, "we'll do it for you." I suspect they are well on their way at the present time.

I had some sympathy for the member for St Catharines in his observations this afternoon because, though he sounded rather like Sterling Lyon in those great debates prior to—

Mr Bradley: My doctor likes it.

Mr Conway: Well, I say that most sincerely. The member for St Catharines has never disguised his view about the role of parliamentary versus judiciary sovereignty, and I did not agree with Sterling Lyon on very much, but I will say that he made the case against the Charter of Rights more passionately and, in my view, more effectively than anyone else back in the period 1979-82. But he lost, and so we have today the situation that my honourable friend complained of. I am not going to engage the debate except to agree with him in this sense, that serving in any Legislature, and more especially serving in any executive council in this land, post-1982, is to serve in a substantially constrained environment. That is a reality, and I think there is certainly a case for that. How good a case remains to be seen.

But imagine then adding additional ingredients to that, and that takes me to the Ontario Medical Association agreement that has been bruited about by the press and some of my friends, including the Leader of the Opposition. I just want to simply make a few observations about this. I will say to members, being on the road, I came out of northern Ontario even more concerned than I was, having spent a lot of time in the winter in my own constituency where unemployment is everywhere. The number of people who are out of work in the resource sector in my county is like I have never seen it in 16 years. It is quite true what has been said by others, that this time it appears in all too many cases that the job is not a layoff, the job is a goner.

Mr Martin: It is free trade.

Mr Conway: My friend from Sault Ste Marie says it is free trade. I think that may be part of it, but obviously I

do not believe that is the entire question. Certainly in the lumber sector that is a part of it. The dollar is clearly a part of it, but so are a number of other factors.

As I meet people at home, and in the north on the weekend, what I hear may be coming very soon in Red Rock and Kapuskasing and Hearst did not make me feel very good at all and it almost made me feel like I was glad I was not in government, because there are some almost intractable problems that my honourable friends opposite are going to have to solve. I wish them well in that. It is not going to be easy, and I hope I am going to be responsible in my criticism.

I ask members to imagine, against that, talking to farmers who see their quotas evaporating or talking to loggers in sawmills who see their jobs washing down the Ottawa River basin; to imagine reading in the Ottawa Citizen about the OMA-Ontario government agreement. Boy, that is a very good agreement. I do not represent one constituent outside of the medical profession who would not give his all to have a shred and a shard of that. I know how difficult it must have been for the member for Ottawa Centre to work her way through that, I know some of the discussions our friends over here had and I know some of the positions I then took and I am quite prepared to talk about some of those today or later.

I wondered, as I read the paper a few weeks ago or a few days ago, how it would feel, as you went to the food bank or as you went to the unemployment office, to read about this agreement. I suspect, deferential as we are in this province, that you would feel: "I want my doctor well paid and this will probably do it. Those Liberals seemed to be fighting a lot with those doctors and this is peace in our time." So there would be a lot of my constituents who would probably say, "Well, on that level, I'm glad they've done it," but as they find out more about this agreement, they would wish, pray and hope for some little opportunity to have some small piece of that heaven.

I come back to my point, the point made by the member for St Catharines about losing some sovereignty, if that is the word, to the courts. Excepting that, Mr Speaker, think about what is left. With what is left, we start contemplating the notion of binding arbitration. I have no difficulty saying outside of the cabinet what I said inside the cabinet on that principle, that there are few things I find more distasteful. I recognize the conflict of interest in which one finds oneself as player and referee in this business. That charge has been made by a number of people, and I heard it from the medical profession over and over again.

As I read the reports of this agreement, I get very excited and not in a very pleasant or positive way. This government, on behalf of this Legislature, appears prepared to turn over under certain conditions to the arbitrator, who has to look at the general state of the Ontario economy, an arbitration of a multibillion-dollar account. That, together with the implications of the Charter of Rights, has the capacity to reduce this Legislature, if not to a nullity, to something damned close, and I really worry about that. I hope it works.

1720

Ms Gigantes: Relax.

Mr Conway: I hope it works. My friend the member for Ottawa Centre says, "Relax," and I am disposed to take her advice. But when I look at this agreement and I see binding arbitration, I see the Rand formula, I see the kind of fee increase—and we will not even talk about utilization, a point that honourable members over here have been trying to make, not understood by very many people in the chamber and certainly not understood by very many people outside. But I really think this agreement is going to be the subject of a lot of debate over the coming months. I have even some suspicion that the Rand formula concept will be so controversial with the radical minority within the Ontario Medical Association that it just might not fly.

Ms Gigantes: Which side?

Mr Conway: I repeat that I suspect there is some chance that the Rand formula, the closed-shop part of this arrangement, will be so wildly controversial for that 8% or 10% of the medical profession with which I have had lots to do over 15 years that it might just scupper the deal. I hope—well, I should not say any more than that, just that I will be watching. I appreciated the former minister's point the other day, "Give the membership a chance to reflect," because she was speaking very knowledgeably on that account. But when I think back to the common front that met the former government in the last election—

Mr White: And found them wanting.

Mr Conway: And found them wanting, very legitimate. I have no difficulty with that.

I think after six months, part of the common front, the OMA, has already got apparently binding arbitration, very generous fee increases and the closed shop. I see that the new Minister of Health, the Chair of Management Board, is well on negotiating with another part of the common front about the right to strike and some other very important and passionately held views. God knows what will happen when that last part of the common front gets to negotiate with the government around its requirements going back to last summer.

More and more I feel like I am in the American Congress. I will be very interested to see how the common front is dealt with in the coming weeks. My guess is that it will take another four to five months before we see the final picture of the redress that this government offers the three pillars of the common front. But if the OMA agreement, such as it has been presented to us, is any indication, Larry Grossman truly is going to look like second-hand Rose in these matters.

Of course, being on the road, I have had the opportunity to travel, as I said earlier in the House this afternoon, to New England with a group from my county to talk about and to look at some technology that will hopefully deal with an economic crisis, quite frankly, in my area around, "Whither the forest industry?" We went to New England to look at these power plants, and I say again, without wanting to repeat myself—and I appreciate the interest of other members. I know the member for Hastings-Peterborough, the Minister of Agriculture and Food,

has been very actively involved in this, and I think he and I have a job to do with his colleagues in government to make sure that every reasonable and constructive effort is made to allow the Ontario government to look at this kind of technology as perhaps a way of providing a market for all of this low-end junk that is choking the industry and ruining a very productive forest. I say that sincerely on behalf of the hundreds and thousands of people whose livelihood in Bancroft, in Barry's Bay, in Denbigh and so many other places is so dependent on this sector, one of the most troubled at the present time in the Ontario economy.

When I was on the road in New England, I accepted an invitation from an old friend. Again, I am sorry the Treasurer is not here, because someone whom I know the member for St Catharines knows well—I am trying to think who over there would remember Wendell Fulton.

Wendell Fulton was for years a—what shall I call him?—a Queen's Park representative of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation. Wendell is a very good friend of mine. He is now retired to his native New Brunswick and he is doing some work there in the public interest. He said to me, when I was up in New Hampshire: "Make sure that you come across to New Brunswick. I want to talk to you and show you some things." And I did. But he said: "As you do, I want you to stop in Bangor, Maine, at a place called The Wholesale Depot." So on the recommendation of a very good friend, I went, as he said, in the interest of understanding cross-border shopping, to a place the like of which I have never seen before.

I have been very concerned, living two and a half hours away from the American border in Pembroke, at the increasing loss of retail business to the big border malls at places like Watertown and Messina in my case. I know you, Mr Speaker, are even more familiar with that. The impact of this cross-border shopping initiative is absolutely serious and becoming all the more so.

On the advice of my friend Wendell Fulton, I went to The Wholesale Depot. I hope and I pray that one of these is not built somewhere across one of those international bridges in southeastern Ontario, because if this ever happens to us, we will face what apparently all of Fredericton and Woodstock, New Brunswick, are now experiencing, which is that virtually everyone in the place on days is coming three hours down Interstate 95 to shop for bargains that are just unbelievable. That is one place in the United States where I did see some things that troubled me a great deal.

I must say on the cross-border shopping account that there were many places in Texas, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine where, quite frankly, I think we have a job to do, because many of the so-called advertised deals are no deal at all. I could not believe a number of things, and I want my friends opposite to know that I went on no spending spree. I bought about \$40 worth of used books at the University of Vermont bookstore and that was the extent of my purchases, save and except a small, little bit of material for my father, which members can maybe guess about. He is a smoker.

At any rate, I was really concerned about the impact of cross-border shopping, not only in our part of the province,

but what I saw in New Brunswick and Maine troubled me, quite frankly, more than anything I have seen in my part of southeastern Ontario. I would hope—and the Minister of Revenue is not here, but the Treasurer is not far away—that the government is making very vigorous representations to the Minister of National Revenue for Canada, the unbelievable Otto Jelinek, who seems to think that part of the solution is putting express lanes on the international bridges.

That to me is madness. I cannot believe—though I am sure there is some argument and I am no expert—but that has to be a madness of a gilt-edged kind. I would expect the Treasurer of Ontario to be making daily, if not hourly, representations to the government of Canada that that is clearly not acceptable. If the member for Sault Ste Marie and others are supporting that argument, and I am sure they are, I wish them success.

But I want to say it is also one of the reasons I am going to be intrigued to see how in the coming days the government is going to deal with the so-called pause day legislation. I understand exactly the pressures the government faces. They are precisely the pressures, and the government has exactly the same options, as any government in this province has had and will have for some time to come.

I am sure that the member for Ottawa Centre has some kind of view of this that is so idiosyncratic that it might contain the grain and the kernel of a painless solution. If she can do that, I just encourage her in every respect. But I will be very interested to see how this government decides the pause day question with a view to the incredible hurt that is being felt and inflicted upon the retail sector right across the province and the thousands of jobs that are affected as a result of that.

A couple of more observations before I turn the floor over to others. A few weeks ago I had the distinct honour to represent my friend the member for Halton Centre in the Environment estimates. I was pleased to do so. I do not know a great deal about the Environment estimates, but I was doing the best I could and I was really struck by—like the leader of our party, I have no end of esteem and regard for the member from Etobicoke-Lakeshore, the current Minister of the Environment. She is committed. She is sensible. She is incredibly diligent and she is, I know, a fair-minded person.

1730

I am telling members, I am seeing some things develop that cause me some real concern, and it raises again a fundamental issue around the way we do business in politics today. Increasingly we all know what we are against. I will tell members the menu of what we are individually and collectively against goes on and on and on.

I listened to the minister during those hours of estimates and I had a very clear notion of what was not on, and I think I understand why it was not on. I have no clue, really, as to how the government is going to solve the problem in the short and in the intermediate term. She is opposed to incineration and she is opposed to a variety of other things, which, as I said earlier, I can understand.

But what are we going to do? Some very good ideas have been offered and some of them have been brought forward by the new government and the previous government and the government before that. I read in the newspapers a short while after those estimates that Toronto, despite what it might have been led to believe by this government and others, will not be allowed to transport its garbage outside of the region, for reasons that were brilliantly put by the Minister of the Environment. A few days later we read in the *Ottawa Citizen*—actually, it was the *Kingston Whig-Standard*, where by the way I am reading these days some truly remarkable stories, I say to my friend—well, no, that is not quite polite. But I just could not believe the story I read in the *Whig-Standard* then about Kingston being allowed for, again, reasons that I understood, to truck its garbage up to the Laidlaw facility hard by Kanata.

Ms Gigantes: What would you have them do?

Mr Conway: My friend the member says, what would I have done? In this respect I will say, they are the government. I am trying to understand their government policy, and the policy in Toronto is, understandably: “No transport of this waste outside of the region. Solve it yourselves.” In Kingston, the answer is, “You may go to Ottawa.” I think I understand some of the casuistry that caused that pair of decisions.

I say to my friend the member for Ottawa Centre and elsewhere over there that I am absolutely convinced that where we are headed in the next few years is the nightmare scenario. The nightmare scenario is, because I listened with such attention to what the member and the Minister of the Environment said, and it could not be more clear—and I hope I am wrong, but I would offer a wee wager, with the proceeds to go to some good cause—that within the lifetime of this Parliament this Minister of the Environment or at least a Minister of the Environment in this government will be forced to expand one or two or three of the current landfills without any opportunity to discuss that. That, I am absolutely convinced, is where we are going to be in two or three years’ time, and I just raise that now because I think there are a lot of people who are going to be very anxious to know what the government is for.

In a similar area, I have been paying attention to what the Minister of Energy is about. I admire the Minister of Energy’s commitment to the energy cause. I really admire the Minister of Energy’s commitment to finding energy alternatives, and that is why I hope she is prepared to support my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Food and myself and others in this wood energy technology if we can show it to be viable in my part of the province. I am very interested to see the developments in the energy debate. Again, I might be a little negative here, and what I say of a criticism of the current government in some real way applies to perhaps our government as well.

I think we all understand what we are opposed to, and I would go one step further. My guess is, we are going to have a great deal of difficulty, though I will fight long and hard for this, to move forward with some additional

nuclear capacity. I know others will oppose me in that. There are a lot of people who are violently opposed to the nuclear option, and the opposition I can understand although I do not share it.

I personally believe that we will not in my lifetime ever build another new hydroelectric station in this province, and I have a county that is scarred, if I can use that word, with these relatively benign facilities, benign in the sense of their general consequences. I think most people would agree that producing electricity by dropping water is probably relatively benign. I do not think we are ever going to build another one of those facilities in my lifetime, and I am 39 years of age. I cannot imagine that anyone will support building a coal-fired plant.

My guess is that what we are going to have—and have some we must, if only to replace a lot of the stock that is going to be up for renewal in the next 10 to 15 years. My impression, listening to the debate, is that all we are going to be able to rely on—not all, but perhaps the workhorse of the alternatives will be natural gas-based electrical energy.

I hope I am wrong, because the price and the environmental consequences of that are really interesting, but I am listening and I am all for conservation. This recession has proven to be the most effective conservation of energy scheme that anyone could have ever imagined. But I say again in the area of energy, as I did a moment ago in the area of garbage that we know what we are opposed to. We are opposed to a lot of things, and one of these days this government and this Legislature are going to have to decide what they are in favour of, particularly as we all look at the issues surrounding the economy. I am not going to repeat some of the data that were offered earlier by the member for Oakville South, but there can be no question about the economic circumstances in which this province finds itself.

This is not a recession like other recessions. The member for Scarborough North, who sits to my immediate right, was talking a few days ago in this Legislature about a number of the statistics and I am going to just repeat a very few of these. Everyone knows about the unemployment rate, everyone understands what is going on in terms of the social assistance rolls, and I do not think that needs to be repeated by me this afternoon.

But I think it is important to observe again that over the past year Ontario has lost roughly 15% of its manufacturing base, and all indications are that those jobs are gone and gone permanently. Within that, our auto parts sector has lost almost 11,000 jobs and some 15% of its workforce. The steel sector has lost almost 10,000 jobs, some 24% of that sector alone. The textile sector is off 21%; furniture has been reduced by some 36%, and on it goes. But steel and auto parts are the mother lode of this economy, and there are a whole series of factors at work in this.

I say to my friends opposite, like them I am very anxious to do everything I can to ensure the social safety net, the wonderful programs that you really understand when you look at this province from downtown Austin or downtown Burlington, Vermont. I do not share the kind of Thatcherite right-wingism that really makes me sick. Because I will tell members that one does not have to be in

Texas very long to understand what violent crime is all about and how that makes people change their daily lives, and to have Texans talk about this wonderful health care system that we have and we ought to fight to the death to protect. I understand the enormous heritage that is there and I want to do everything I possibly and reasonably can to sustain that.

But let me say, as I conclude my remarks, that the wealth-creating capacity of one of the world's most successful economies, certainly in the last 50 years, is under an enormous strain. No amount of cheap politics on my part or easy partisanship on the part of others is going to change what is happening in the steel sector or what is going on in the auto parts sector. I wish it were as easy as saying no to the Mexican-American-Canadian free trade talks and I wish it were as easy as saying, "That Canadian-US free trade deal is terrible," and certainly parts of it are and some of it has impacted very seriously on my communities.

1740

But I repeat: It behooves all of us to understand that the wealth-creating capacity of one of the world's most successful economies is under an attack the like of which it has not experienced ever before in the modern period. I am confident that there is a way out of this difficulty. I do not know who it was earlier today who said, but I support him entirely, that we must increase investments in those areas of our economy that are going to allow us to compete in those areas of enterprise and opportunity where there will be a hope of succeeding so that we can generate the kind of dollars we are going to want to have to maintain the social safety net and all of those wonderful programs that we hold dear. But that surely is the business to which we must turn our attention.

I applaud the Treasurer in some of the initiatives that he has taken over what has been a very, very difficult winter. I applaud him when I know he fights back some of what Stephen Lewis would call the wackos in the democratic left who would have him buy into panaceas that are just that.

So I conclude my remarks by saying that, like Charles Kuralt, I found life on the road to be a truly interesting and edifying experience.

Mr White: I will be brief. I want to thank the member opposite for his very learned, interesting discourse. I am sure that he will make a very valuable contribution to American academia.

I did want to pick up on one small point which he mentioned, which was the commitment he evidenced to the nuclear power industry. I think that nuclear power obviously has a significant place in Ontario at the moment. However, I think it behooves us to wait until after the full assessment, which has commenced just a few days ago, before we make our commitment to it. There is, after all, a large number of groups which are invested in serious study of this issue, some 23 groups, and Ontario Hydro itself and the provincial government as a bystander. It seems to me to be a little precious to be making this kind of commitment before we have had this learned discourse before that body.

I know in my riding on Monday I was pleased to see the Minister of Energy addressing a group called Durham Nuclear Awareness. She said we were not going to close nuclear plants, but rather it is a serious concern: How do we supply the energy needs of our province? People in Durham Nuclear Awareness, many of whom are committed opponents, like the members of CUPE local 1000 who work in those power plants, 60% of whom live in my riding, were all able to support in common the Minister of Energy, who did an excellent job in discussing this very complicated issue. I think it behooves us to do that prior to making a commitment to a particular form of energy.

Mr Mahoney: I want to congratulate the member for Renfrew North. It has been some time since I have had the opportunity to enjoy his prose, which he used to share with us in past years and go on at some length with his learned experience around the province. I really do congratulate him.

I was interested in his comments in relationship to the Ministry of Energy and the Minister of the Environment, who is here now. She may or may not have heard them, but I am convinced she heard them on television. I am convinced there is a strategy, actually, between the two ministries. I am convinced that the Ministry of Energy is going to allow the brownouts to occur so that we do not see the garbage that will be piling up in our streets and our parks. That is clearly the long-range thinking in the plan of the government and of both ministries.

I was interested in some of the interjections about the faults of the past government, because the reality is, if you talk about my community in the region of Peel, they were ready to go. As a matter of fact, dating back to when I was a member of regional council, they were ready to go. The hearings were done. I mean, they were in a position where if this minister had allowed them to proceed, we would not now be looking at the requirement to freeze development around the Britannia sanitary landfill site, which is the clearest indication I have ever seen that this minister and this government intend to expand the Britannia site for some time, contrary to agreements entered into by Mississauga council and Peel regional council to ensure that the next dump site went into the city of Brampton. That will not occur now. There will be an expansion of Britannia to take all of Peel's garbage and the minister knows it.

Mr Phillips: I am pleased to respond to the member's comments and say how much I appreciated his observations on his own riding and on other parts of the province on a firsthand basis, to remind us of what I think is going to be the major challenge for the budget on Monday, and that is to kickstart the economy once again.

As I think all of us now know, 1,600 jobs are lost every single day in this province—1,600 jobs a day, seven days a week. As the Treasurer is fond of saying, the job creation program created 10,000 jobs for one year only. We lose that many jobs in a week. So I appreciate what the member has brought to us, as I say, a firsthand exposure of the challenges around the province.

I think he also pointed out quite correctly that Monday, when the budget is presented, will be an important day for

the new government. It is the day when it fully assumes the responsibility, as I am sure the Treasurer would appreciate. We will be looking very much at that budget on Monday to kickstart the economy. It is extremely important that the confidence of the people of the province be restored on Monday, that we begin to see a job creation program. As I said, in the previous five years we saw 100,000 jobs created each year, 300 jobs a day, and in the last year we have seen 1,600 jobs a day lost. I am very much looking forward, as I said, on Monday to a program that will assure all of us that we will begin looking at what is finally job creation.

Mr McGuinty: It is a pleasure to hear from the member for Renfrew North, who is always a model of dispassion, moderation and complete objectivity.

I was pleased to hear his comments and the relationship—I guess the dilemma—that is being faced by both the Minister of Energy and the Minister of the Environment. They seem to have taken an approach with the utmost sincerity. I do not think anyone can doubt their motives, but I would term it as essentially they are advancing policies of hope. They are hoping, for instance in the issue of the Toronto area garbage, that if we clamp the lid on, by espousing or praying to the holy trinity of conservationists, the 3Rs, the people will remedy the problem themselves.

The Minister of Energy has indicated that through a promotion of energy conservation efficiency and collateral generation, the people of the province will effectively curtail the need for future generations. I would bring to the attention of both ministers the lesson that may be offered to us by Big Green, the resolution which failed, unfortunately quite miserably, to pass in California.

That resolution required, if it were passed, a severe infringement on the lifestyle of the people of California. There were restrictions in terms of operating a gasoline barbecue within the municipal limits, driving a car within certain areas of the city. The lesson there was that although it met with a great deal of support at the outset, ultimately it failed, and I think there is some limitation that we ought, as reasonable and responsible representatives, to acknowledge.

1750

Mr Conway: I must say to the Treasurer, by the way, the most interesting part of my travels was meeting in Fredericton a young girl who cherished a letter most felicitously written by the Treasurer himself. So he should know that he has got a fan club. I think he knows the person to whom I make reference.

I want to comment briefly on the comment made by the member for Durham Centre. My point is simply this: Whether it is in the environment question, in the energy matter or in all others, to govern is to decide. The public will rightly expect that a cabinet and a Legislature will not only listen to all of those people in the community who rightly will want to have their views expressed and heard, but at the end of the day, whether it is garbage disposition or the kind of electrical energy that is going to allow this economy hopefully to continue to produce the wealth that we all want to redistribute in health care, day care and a

variety of other wonderfully good causes about which there can be no disagreement, the public of Ontario will rightfully assume that the government will govern by making some decisions, admittedly in tough, tough areas.

Of course, I know all about the environmental assessment hearings. I noticed that they are under way, launched on Earth Day. My only question is: Is there any prospect that those discussions will be concluded in such time as to give this government or a successor government any hope of making decisions that are going to meet whatever community need there exists? That is my point.

Of course we want to listen and we are going to have to look at options. I have said for years and I say again that I support very strongly the nuclear power options, not as an exclusive way of meeting the energy needs of today and tomorrow but as an important and positive part of that program. But I understand how others might disagree.

To govern is to decide. I await the decisions, most especially of Monday and the days to follow.

Mr Stockwell: It is with interest that I will await Monday's pronouncements from the Treasurer on the state of the union, the state of the economy and the state of the New Democratic government.

They have a document that they have in fact endorsed, with many of their recommendations and priorities, that ran an election for them, that was the engine for their thoughts. That particular document is the Agenda for People.

The difficulty that this government has today is that during those times when the election was being fought in many different ridings in this province, the Agenda for People was used as a quick statement when it came to specific issues. The economy at the time was very, very different, the situation was very different with this particular government in opposition, and now the Treasurer comes forward next Monday with a budget that has many people in this province hoping. The budget that the Treasurer will bring forward next Monday will be a blueprint for this government and this province on how we are going to go about recovering from this daily recession, 1,600 jobs per day. How are we going to recover from this difficulty that we have found ourselves in?

More and more, it is becoming an Ontario-led recession. It is very clear that this province is having great difficulties resolving itself to that conclusion. We have dropped in the unemployment rate by two or three positions in this country. Our manufacturing sector is being, as suggested, assaulted; it is being annihilated. The sectors that are on the serious list would number higher than ever in this province, than ever in the history of this province.

The NDP's Agenda for People addressed spending, it addressed program expansion and it addressed inequities that the NDP felt were in the system. The difficulty that this government faces today is that the Agenda for People did not deal with unemployment, with job shutdowns, with plant closures and with an economy that is slowly slipping over the edge.

Mr Mahoney: How slowly?

Mr Stockwell: Not very slowly. I guess it is getting a little quicker every day.

The dilemma that I think this government faces is it does not really have a plan on how to address the issues that we as constituents of the province face. They do not have a plan on job creation. If they had a plan, I am certain it would be here before us today.

We are going to hear about job creation in the budget, we are going to hear about deficit finance and we are going to hear about government spending. Some of the major planks that this political party stood for in the election have been passed off on the Fair Tax Commission, they have been passed off on an interim housing bill, they have been passed off on the standing committee of government agencies and they have been passed off to other agencies and boards in this government.

On Monday this government will come forward with a budget that is going to put the people of Ontario back to work. This government is going to come forward with a budget that is going to resolve government spending and is going to resolve all the problems that the people of this province face. I will look forward to that budget, because in the history of the party that is governing today its members have had glib, one-sentence answers to very difficult and strategically cumbersome problems. All their problems have been stated in this Agenda for People, and all their responses to the problems, their solutions. At this point, they are almost laughable. The agenda for landfill is exactly that; it is an agenda for landfills.

I say to the Treasurer, we will ask for his job creation programs, we will ask to see how he is getting out of the lives of business so that it can take the people out of the food banks. More business has taken people out of food bank lines than any government in the history of this country. The Treasurer is going to have to get serious about a whole bunch of issues, not the least of which is job creation and wealth. Where is wealth created? He is going to have to learn the very difficult lesson and his party is going to have to learn the very difficult lesson that wealth is created in the private sector.

By increasing taxes and ramming it on to the people's backs with wage protection funds and so on, the Treasurer is not creating any new wealth. The Agenda for People spoke about new spending, new programs and new taxes. The Treasurer had better realize he is going to have to get into the real world and deal with job creation, business creation and real unemployment. Until he deals with those factors this Agenda for People will be practically worthless.

I cannot wait for Monday to see what this socialist democratic government has come up with to put this province back on track. After Monday, I do not want to hear any more about free trade, I do not want to hear any more about the GST, I do not want to hear any more about the unfair federal government. What I want to hear about are the programs and initiatives that this government has come up with to put the people of this province back to work. When the Treasurer comes forward on Monday, the initiatives had better be there, because the people in this province are waiting to see his answers to their problems.

One suggestion I would make to the Treasurer is that he examine all facets of this particular province when it comes to spending, when it comes to housing starts, when

It comes to construction jobs, when it comes to the manufacturing sector, when it comes to cross-border shopping. He has every sector in trouble right now. He has a recession that is being felt in this province worse than in any province across this country. He is losing 1,600 jobs a day. No more excuses. The excuses time is over. It is time for action, it is time for initiative, it is time to stand up and be counted. On Monday the Treasurer is going to be assessed, and if he comes forward with a pale package, a hopeless, pale package such as the Agenda for People, he will be a dismal and colossal failure.

I accept the fact that he cannot fund schools 60%. I accept the fact that he is going to have to backtrack on landfill sites. I expect him to backtrack on a number of these initiatives. What I do not want to see him backtrack on is real employment, real growth and a real sector improvement that puts the people of the province back to work.

Noting that it is 6 o'clock, Mr Speaker, I will be more than happy to adjourn the debate for today.

Hon Mr Laughren: You have lost the audience, Chris.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): It now being 6 o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, 25 April.

Hon Miss Martel: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It was agreed among the three House leaders to have a voice vote on this matter today. I would ask for the consent to proceed with that.

The Acting Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent? Agreed to.

The Acting Speaker: We revert back to Mr Laughren's resolution. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

An hon member: No.

The Acting Speaker: I heard a no.

All those in favour of Mr Laughren's motion please say "aye."

All those against Mr Laughren's motion please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1802.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	Minister of Education
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economic
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	House leader
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
MacKenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Niemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Winter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 24 April 1991

Members' statements

Agriculture in Northern Ontario	935
Mr Ramsay	
Automobile insurance	935
Mr Runciman	
Environmental education	935
Mr Wiseman	
Unemployment in St Catharines	936
Mr Bradley	
Pornography	936
Mr Carr	
Anniversary of Armenian massacre	936
Mr Owens	
Timber industry	936
Mr Conway	
Anniversary of Chernobyl disaster	937
Mr Jackson	
Durham College	937
Mr Mills	

Statement by the ministry

Municipal enumeration	938
Ms Wark-Martyn	

Responses

Municipal enumeration	938
Ms Y. O'Neill	
Mr Stockwell	

Oral questions

Ministerial responsibility	939
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Mr Scott	
Mr Harris	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Harnick	
Land-use planning	944
Mr O'Connor	
Mr Cooke	
Ministerial responsibility	945
Mr Scott	
Mr Hampton	
Mr Harris	
French-language education	945
Mrs MacKinnon	
Mrs Boyd	
Ministerial responsibility	945
Mr Conway	
Mr Rae	
Mr Harris	

Motion

Private members' public business	94
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	94

Petitions

Nursing homes	94
Mr Brown	
Pornography	94
Mr McLean	
Unemployment	94
Mr Brown	
French-language services	94
Mr McLean	

Report by committee

Standing committee on government agencies	94
Mr Runciman	
Agreed to	94

First readings

Access to Courts Act, 1991, Bill 77	94
Mr Scott	
Agreed to	94
Ministry of Colleges and Universities	
Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 78	94
Mr Perruzza	
Agreed to	94
Gasoline Tax Amendment Act (Aviation Fuel), 1991,	
Bill 79	94
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	94

Government motion

Interim supply, motion 18	94
Mr Laughren	94
Mr Bradley	94
Mrs Haslam	95
Ms Gigantes	95
Mr Sutherland	95
Mr Phillips	95
Mr Carr	95
Mr White	95
Mr Turnbull	95
Mr Hayes	96
Mr Christopherson	96
Mr Conway	96
Mr Mahoney	96
Mr McGuinty	96
Mr Stockwell	97
Agreed to	97

Other business	Member's comment	947
	Miss Martel	
Report of chief election officer	Adjournment	971
The Speaker		
Question period	Lists of members	
Mr McLean		
Role of the Speaker	Members and their responsibilities	972
Mr McLean	Committees of the Legislative Assembly	975
Premier's comments		
Mr Nixon		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 24 avril 1991

Première lecture	Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur le ministère	
Loi de 1991 sur l'accès aux tribunaux,	des Collèges et Universités, projet de loi 78	948
projet de loi 77	M. Perruzza	
M. Scott	Adoptée	948
Adoptée	Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi de la taxe sur l'essence	
	(carburant aviation), projet de loi 79	948
	Mlle Wark-Martyn	
	Adoptée	948

A2 ON
x1
023



23 1991

23 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 25 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 25 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 25 April 1991

The House met at 1000.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL

Mr Wessenger moved second reading of Bill 68, An Act to amend the Workers' Compensation Act.

M. Wessenger propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 68, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur les accidents du travail.

Mr Wessenger: It is with some degree of satisfaction that I speak in this House about a piece of legislation that, if passed, will lead the way in addressing one of the serious concerns of health workers in Canada today. This bill will make occupational exposure to blood-borne pathogens and the diseases they cause more likely to be compensable under the Workers' Compensation Act. This will include hepatitis B, HIV, syphilis, malaria, babesiosis, brucellosis, leptospirosis, arboviral infection, relapsing fever, Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, human T-lymphotropic virus type one, viral haemorrhagic fever and cytomegalovirus infections.

The diseases which I have just listed may be transmitted from the infected individual when blood or certain other bodily fluids are exchanged. Because it is the exposure to the blood or bodily fluids that carries the risk of infection, individuals whose occupational duties place them at risk of blood exposure are also at risk of becoming infected with these blood-borne pathogens, developing the disease and, in some cases, dying.

In the last decade, thousands of persons with these diseases have been treated in the health care system in Ontario. We have no reason to believe that there will not be many more. At this moment, for example, we are powerless against the fatal disease of AIDS. It is a deadly disease with no vaccine and no known cure and is threatening that section of our population we depend on the most, our young and middle-aged adults.

As a government, it is our responsibility to ensure that not only the safety of our workers but, should they fall victim to any of these dreaded viruses, their livelihood as well is protected.

The incidence of hepatitis B in Canada is hard to determine because only a fraction of the cases are reported, but testing donated blood indicates that 5% of all Canadians have had hepatitis B at some point in their lives and some of these people continue to be carriers. There is a high risk with respect to carriers of developing liver cancer and cirrhosis of the liver.

As far as the HIV virus is concerned, we in Ontario have had some 200 reported cases of occupational exposure and they are at present under surveillance by the Workers' Compensation Board. Although as of this moment none of these cases have seroconverted into full-blown AIDS, the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta have documented thoroughly some 25 such cases. They include such occupations as dentists, dental assistants, surgeons, nurses, ambulance drivers, morticians and laboratory technicians, as well as blood plasma and tissue workers. Virtually all those confirmed infections occurred after an accidental injury, such as a needle stick, cuts with sharp objects, puncture wounds, splashes in the eyes or mouth or contamination of open wounds on skin.

Studies have indicated that the risk of a person contracting hepatitis B from exposure to blood products is up to 30% and HIV is up to 0.9%, while other blood-borne pathogens I have mentioned studies show fall in the range between 10% to 35% from exposure to blood-borne products.

The ever-increasing prevalence of reported exposures has led to a publication called Guidelines for Prevention of Transmission of Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Hepatitis B Virus to Health Care and Public Safety Workers, which gives recommendations for precautions to take while dealing with not only AIDS patients but all patients suspected of having a contagious virus.

While I applaud the intent of these guidelines and appreciate the necessity of following them, the bottom line is there is still a risk in dealing with hepatitis B, HIV and other blood-borne pathogens, which will always be a real risk despite exhaustive precautions.

Over the past 10 years, when HIV was first identified, its various clinical manifestations have infected thousands of men and women, all of whom ultimately face death as a result. Our initial lack of knowledge about this disease has allowed myth, rumour and innuendo to flourish. However, research has made staggering progress in providing new information today. With a better understanding resulting from an ever-expanding base of knowledge, we are better able to address associated health care issues, and one of these health care issues is the risk of infection while trying to help those in need.

This piece of legislation I am introducing in the House today is designed to recognize this risk and appropriately deal with it under the Workers' Compensation Act. Workers' compensation legislation has its roots in the inability of workers to sue effectively for work-related injuries through the courts. It is basically a provincially based, no-fault insurance scheme which covers most workers who have accidents or develop illnesses through their job.

The current Workers' Compensation Act is based on the model implemented in 1915 and over the years there have been amendments which were necessary for their times and circumstances. I would suggest that we need this

amendment today to meet the present circumstance of blood-borne pathogen disease. We can no longer hide our heads in the sand and hope this problem will go away.

In the last few years, even the insurance industry has recognized the problem with respect to terminal diseases and we have seen it rise to the occasion and make pre-payments on insurance policies in the case of such situations. Surely the Workers' Compensation Board should also respond to the threat of blood-borne pathogens to health care workers.

We must educate our workers, we must instruct our employees, we must make everyone aware, and most of all, we must protect them. We have always protected the interests of workers and believe in them in this party, and we believe we should continue to do so. This piece of legislation is only a small step, but it does make an improvement in the Workers' Compensation Act by changing the burden of proof with respect to these diseases. I ask for members' support.

1010

Mr Offer: I stand today to speak to the proposed amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act, in particular section 122 of the act. The proposed amendment today is one which I believe we all recognize in this Legislature is very important, talks to crucially important matters, but I state that there is much in this amendment which has not been stated, and it is on that basis that I cannot support the proposed amendments.

I cannot support the proposed amendments because they leave out so much that is necessary for us as legislators to know before we can support an amendment of this nature. Too much is left unsaid. Too many profound questions are not addressed, and as such, unless I and, I would suggest, though certainly without knowing at this point, other members of this Legislature, have answers to questions, then it could not be supported in good conscience.

I want to use some of the time today, and I think it is only fair and proper to do so, to indicate what some of those questions are, what are some of my concerns in terms of the position, after a great deal of thought and discussion, that has been taken.

I think that we recognize, in terms of that part of the amendment which talks to the diseases indicated, that these are diseases which have a tremendous impact, a devastation not only on behalf of the person but for his family and his friends, that in many cases these particular diseases are in fact fatal, and it is one which I believe all of us want to address as best we can. It is one which we truly do understand in terms of its impact, in terms of its extension into the lives of so many other persons. Families are affected, friends are affected, relationships of all kinds are affected, and of course we must do what we can do.

But as I talk about this particular amendment, I note that it creates a presumption that if a worker in a health-related field who comes into contact with a human bodily fluid and contracts—and I take away the words “as a result”—a particular type and form of disease, then it shall be presumed that the contraction of that disease is as a

result of the employ of the worker, and the scope of occupation is one which is severely limited to the health field.

Hence, my first question: What about those fields outside of the health field? What about the police officer? Not included. What about the firefighter? Not included. What about a teacher? Not included. What about a variety of other persons in other occupations not included in this amendment who in many ways come into contact with bodily fluid as is suggested in this amendment—a question I pose which is not addressed in this amendment, which until it is addressed cannot be supported by myself.

The next aspect to this amendment which, after some serious deliberation, causes me not to support it is the whole question of the presumption. I recognize and read from the amendment that it states, “the disease shall be deemed to have been due to the nature of that employment unless the contrary is proved.” We must recognize that this creates a presumption, which is rebuttable.

My second form of questions: If it is a presumption, and if it is a presumption which is rebuttable, then what is the mechanism suggested to rebut the presumption? What is the tribunal, the hearing, and who are the persons delegated with the authority to determine whether the presumption is rebuttable? Who are they? Where do they come from? What type of evidence will they be permitted to accept? Will there be cross-examination? What protections have been put in this amendment in terms of the inquiry around rebutting the presumption not stated in this amendment?

The amendment to the legislation is one which at first reading sounds quite proper in its direction, but that is not enough in this Legislature. We have to look beyond that. We have to say: “If this were in fact agreed upon, how could this presumption be rebutted? What degree of proof is necessary? Who listens? Who advocates? Is there an authority, an entrance into the personal and private lives of those persons before this tribunal? How far is the inquiry allowed to extend? What protections in terms of evidence, in terms of a myriad of other legislative acts are there to protect individuals?

In good conscience, I cannot even in principle stand in favour of a piece of legislation, an amendment, which does not answer or even come to address these particular questions.

It is a serious amendment and for that reason we have to ask serious questions dealing with the protection of privacy, of secrecy. We have to ask questions as to whether decisions made by a deciding body, which is not indicated here, are appealable, and if so, to where, and if so, on what basis, on what grounds? What balance of authority is required to change a decision or indeed, for that matter, to make the case at first instance?

These are things which are not indicated in this amendment. It is for that reason that as I believe I have indicated twice before, I have large problems in accepting it. I think it is only fair and proper that we ask these questions. I think it is our responsibility to demand these types of answers before we can, even at first instance, accept this amendment.

An amendment of this nature in dealing with the subject matter, in dealing with the scope, in dealing with its ramifications must and should have included the decision-making body that has been set up to rebut the presumption, must and should have included the type and weight of evidence required to rebut the presumption, must and should have included, potentially, individuals not just related to the health field. That is something which is outside and not addressed in this amendment and it is something which I believe is crucial to the core of this amendment.

1020

I believe we must address some of the issues which have been spoken to in the amendment, but do we do this in terms of this type of amendment or do we do it in the area of making certain that the workplace is safer for all persons? I believe that is the direction we must take. I believe we should not limit the concerns underlying this amendment just to those who are in the medical field. We must expand those concerns to all persons in all workplaces. But to do so in a comprehensive, fundamental fashion requires us to look not at amending the Workers' Compensation Act, but rather to making certain that the workplaces for all persons are as safe as possible in that regard, if that be a slogan, a phrase.

We just last year passed a new piece of legislation, the occupational health and safety legislation. That is a major step towards ensuring the safety of the workers in the workplace. It is a major step to addressing the underlying concerns as founded in this amendment. It is, in my opinion, the direction in which we should go. The occupational health and safety legislation is an important piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation which is working. It is a piece of legislation which carries with it the support of employer and employee. It is a piece of legislation the previous government was very proud of. It is a piece of legislation which must be used in terms of addressing the underlying concerns in this amendment.

But it is this amendment to which I speak, and I believe that as a result of the questions posed by myself, after some great thought by myself on this matter, I cannot support this amendment. I cannot support it because it does not speak to other persons in other areas of employment. It does not speak to the type of decision-making tribunal decided on to hear these matters. It does not speak to the burden of proof required to rebut this presumption. It does not speak to the evidentiary guarantees for those who are called before the tribunal. It does not speak to the privacy of individuals who may have a relationship with individuals who are before this tribunal.

These are important questions which have not been addressed in this amendment, questions that require and demand answers before I can support such an amendment.

Mrs Witmer: I would like to begin my remarks today by indicating that I strongly support legislative proposals that are designed to protect employees in the workplace and/or to compensate workers for occupationally acquired diseases. However, I am not convinced that Bill 68 will serve either of these goals.

In first looking at the amendments, I thought it was relatively simple. However, the more I look, the more I ask, the more questions this piece of legislations asks and I found no answers to my questions. This amendment has far-reaching implications for individuals and the rights of individuals throughout this province.

I have some great concerns and I have some reservations about this bill because of the impact it has on individual rights. I also question the timing of this bill. I question why it is a bill as opposed to a resolution. I question what the impact will be of this bill. Unfortunately, in this amendment, there is too much being left unsaid. It is very complex.

In dealing with the appropriateness of a bill versus a resolution, it could have been dealt with as a resolution. We could have called on the Minister of Labour to place these occupations and these diseases in schedule 3 of the Workers' Compensation Act. That is already allowed for at the present time. In dealing with it in the manner that is being done today, it opens up the question of how to deal with other diseases in the future. We will have to determine whether the relationship between a disease and a place of work should be covered through legislation and added on to the section to which we are currently debating amendments or whether the ministry should add it to schedule 3.

I also question the timing of this legislation. We know that the whole area of workers' compensation is currently under review by the Workers' Compensation Board and the Ministry of Labour. We also know that this House is dealing with a review of workers' compensation. Why is this issue being dealt with now at this time in isolation of the complete review? Why is it being dealt with now at a time when we do not have all of the answers to a very, very complex piece of legislation?

Another concern I have: The presumption in this legislation is that it occurred in the workplace. If this is enacted, obviously employers will be very anxious to confirm the health status of their workers prior to extending employment opportunities. What impact on the worker? What impact on the rights of workers? What impact on the rights of employers? How could the presumption be rebutted? Will there be a tribunal? What body is going to be set up to deal with the rebuttal? I am concerned about the possible invasion into the personal and private lives of the individuals involved, but the one question that is left unsaid is, what will the procedure be? What will be the process for the rebuttal? How is it going to be dealt with?

There is another thing I am not sure of. When I look at this list, I do not know how this list of blood-borne diseases was developed, because the transmission of these listed diseases is varied and it includes contact with dog, cow or horse ticks; diseased bats and rodents; the ingestion of infested meat, milk or cheese; contact with malaria-carrying female mosquitoes; and sexual contact with infected persons. Was there—and this is a very serious question—any workplace risk analysis completed? The answer is probably no. That is why I say there are many, many questions that are left unanswered. Therefore, I feel it is extremely important before passing this bill that we obtain

the answers to those questions. It is simply not a simple bill. It does invade the rights of the individuals. It can invade their personal lives. It raises more questions than it answers.

1030

I would suggest that this issue be addressed in the complete review of the Workers' Compensation Board. It is an important issue. There is a need to protect all of our employees in the workplace and I am not convinced that this bill includes all of those individuals. We do need to compensate workers for occupationally acquired diseases and I am not convinced that this amendment will do that. So at this time I would indicate to members that I cannot support the amendment as it is without receiving the answers to the questions that I have raised.

Mr Frankford: This is the first opportunity I have had to speak in relation to my medical training and I would like to thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity.

I certainly am very much in favour of the principle of this bill. I think it serves a valuable purpose by recognizing that there are these diseases which are occupationally related and are a hazard to health workers. It is an interesting list of diseases, and although I think some people have thought that this was primarily about AIDS, we have a number of viral conditions here. I must admit that some of them are things which I was not trained in, that were not recognized when I trained a number of years ago. I think that this is one of the things which was in mind when the bill was drafted, that new viral diseases have occurred. We certainly never imagined that there would be a disease like AIDS, totally unknown 20 years ago. I think that we have to recognize the possibility that there could be other viral diseases, many of which have a very long period of incubation.

In my experience in general practice, of course, I have had to deal with workers' compensation cases many times, and one of the problems of compensation in the past has been the accident-related nature of the claims. I think there is recognition that we have to change this to more presumption of work-related illnesses where one cannot find a particular accident. I think members of this House, in their constituency business, will have spent a great deal of time in relation to the claims about the accidents, and I think that in health care we very much have that problem. When a needle stick does occur, is it reported and can one know for a considerable time, in many cases, what the consequences are, what viral illnesses will come from it?

In my research, I got a copy of Harrison's textbook of medicine, which is a standard textbook, and there they list in the contents health workers' precautions in relation to hepatitis B and AIDS. I think these are the most important diseases, and certainly in my experience the most common ones, but I think there is value in the list of diseases that we have here.

As I say, AIDS is the one there is the most concern about, but perhaps I can say something about hepatitis B, again something on which the technical work is relatively recent. When I was trained, hepatitis was less clearly categorized. There is now clear understanding of the nature of hepatitis B, which is a blood-borne virus, and where there

are distinct risks for health workers. I think perhaps this is the one which brought most concern about occupationally related diseases. Members of the House may be interested to know the history, that this was found to be quite common in workers in renal dialysis, kidney dialysis, and I think this is a very good example of the latent, unrecognized risks of viral diseases.

The member for Mississauga North raised questions about how one would be showing the presumption. I do not believe that it is nearly as much a problem as he suggests. I think this does go along with procedures that exist in workers' compensation and, as I say, I think this can well be part of the thrust towards a greater recognition of compensability of work-related conditions, as opposed to accidents, which I think is something which clearly is going to be developed in relation to workers' compensation in this House.

So, as I say, I am in favour of the principle of the bill. I have no hesitation in supporting it and I would like to commend my colleague for bringing it forward and raising the House's awareness of the significance of these viral diseases.

Mr J. Wilson: I am pleased to be able to join the debate today on Bill 68, a private member's bill, which creates a rebuttable presumption so that health care workers who handle or come into contact with human bodily fluids in the course of their employment and subsequently contract a blood-borne disease would be presumed to have a disease as a result of the nature of their employment, unless the contrary is shown.

I commend the member for Simcoe Centre for raising this issue, which I know is and must be a concern to every member in this House. Blood-borne diseases are a reality that often manifest themselves in the workplace, therefore injuring workers. I think we would all agree on that.

But like my colleague the member for Waterloo North, and the member for Mississauga North who spoke earlier, I have some concerns with this bill put forward by the member for Simcoe Centre. First, I call into question the real commitment of the government to enhancing compensation in the workplace because of the nature of this statutory amendment. The revision is not being put forward by the Minister of Labour, but through the forum of private members' legislation.

It seems to me that if the government were truly serious about this issue it would not put this amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act through the private members' bill process when we all know that very, very few private members' bills in history ever make it or are enacted into law. It seems to me it would have been better for the Minister of Labour to use the current provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act to either put it through order in council, which would be a very fast and efficient way of amending the act, or to pass a resolution in this House which would amend the schedule 3 or 4 and again be much faster than the private member's process.

1040

But that said, I am still uncertain as to what would be accomplished if the legislation that we are debating today

were to pass. As I have mentioned, the proposed amendment provides a presumption of work-relatedness to health care workers who contract blood-borne diseases. It is in response to this bill that the Workers' Compensation Board has stated: "This type of presumption is available through the regulation-making provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act. The presumption of work-relatedness for industrial diseases is applied when a disease and a corresponding process is entered in schedule 3 of the regulation 951." So what it is saying is there is already a process in place. We have schedule 3 and schedule 4 of the current act, and it seems to me that this bill put forward today, Bill 68, is redundant in the extreme.

The Workers' Compensation Board has already made it policy to consider claims for the infectious diseases delineated in this proposed amendment as put forward by the member for Simcoe Centre. I would ask the member for Simcoe Centre to simply contact the Workers' Compensation Board—he may have done that—to find out and have clearly spelled out for him how the board now handles this critical issue. The board has general procedures within its complex case unit (diseases) section that covers infectious diseases. Within its complex case unit (diseases) branch the board handles all industrial claims and all claims from infectious diseases. In addition, blood-borne diseases are also covered by this section of the board.

This brings me to two additional concerns with this private member's bill. Why were these blood-borne diseases spelled out specifically within the amendment that we are debating today when they appear to be encompassed within the existing Workers' Compensation Act and are covered by the Workers' Compensation Board's current operating procedures?

Secondly, I fear that this bill is not a progression but a regression. I once again quote from the proposed amendment, subsection 122(9b), the amendment we are debating today: "If the worker contracted a blood-borne disease and at or before the date of the disablement was employed in or by a hospital, clinic, treatment centre, medical or dental office, school of medicine or nursing, sanitarium, convalescent or nursing home, home for the aged, medical laboratory, visiting nursing service, ambulance service or any similar institution, facility or service, in any process in which he or she handled or came into contact with human bodily fluids, the disease shall be deemed to have been due to the nature of that employment unless the contrary is proved." That is the end of the quote from the amendment today.

Why does this bill limit the right to compensation in the workplace for those employees who contract a blood-borne disease to health care employees only? It is disturbing, and I think the member for Mississauga North made that point very clearly. Currently, the board does not discriminate against non-health-care employees like policemen and a number of other professions who, when they come across a traffic accident, may come into contact with contaminated blood. The board does compensate, currently, all employees, regardless of profession, who are stricken with a blood-borne disease in the workplace.

I am also having trouble with the inclusion in subsection 122(9b) of this amendment of the term "human bodily fluids" as causing blood-borne diseases when handled by health care employees. "Bodily fluids," in this amendment and in any subsequent proposals brought forward by the government, needs better definition. What does it entail? As a result of subsection 9b of this amendment we have a restricted statement in terms of eligible employees for compensation.

As I mentioned, it covers only health care employees, and we have vague wording in terms of employees contracting blood-borne diseases by handling and coming into contact with human bodily fluids. I think it bears mentioning that out of approximately 100,000 HIV/AIDS cases reported in Canada and the United States none have identified bodily fluids such as saliva, urine or tears as the means of transmission of that infectious disease. I feel the wording of 9b creates more problems than it actually solves.

In the end, I would like to say I think that this was a poorly thought-out amendment, although I agree and my party agrees with the principle and its intention. I would ask the member for Simcoe Centre to wait until the reviews now under way by the Workers' Compensation Board, both an internal review and there are currently plans for a complete review of these sections of the act.

The board itself acknowledges that it is handling blood-borne diseases and the compensation thereof and I would ask the member and the government to do their homework with the board and become completely briefed before proceeding with this legislation because I feel it is redundant, and if they are very serious it should be done through order in council if at the end of the review there is a need.

Ms S. Murdock: This, as we have heard, is a bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act and I rise today to support the bill introduced by the member for Simcoe Centre.

All of us in this House have at one time or another worked to help our constituents represent themselves in workers' compensation cases, some more often than others. In my riding of Sudbury, while I worked with both Elie Martel and the government House leader, many of my cases, too many, dealt with occupational disease. Particularly I recall my personal battle for recognition by the board for the hand-arm vibration syndrome, and too well do I remember the jubilation when the gold-dust miner cases from Timmins were finally recognized by the board. Hundreds of workers left widows or widowers and their children to collect whatever compensation the board provided.

The process to have a work-related disease recognized by the Industrial Disease Standards Panel is long and arduous. In the case of hand-arm vibration syndrome, or white hand as it is often called, the battle for its recognition by workers who use vibratory equipment started long before my arrival on the WCB scene. Elie Martel had fought for years with the board to admit it as an occupationally induced disease, and even so it was over two years of my time before the board's policy was changed to reflect the realities of the working world. The cost for all parties while a case goes through every level of appeal is heart-rending, while the process is slow.

With recognition of a disease accepted, the workers and families of those workers do not have to beg. The presumption is that they contracted the disease in the course of their employment, and such recognition can only be rebutted by showing that their work did not cause the disease. That is why I support this bill. It should be a given that health care workers may contract blood-borne diseases in their work, and no health care worker in this province should have to wait two, five or 10 years or more before such a reality is accepted or presumed.

I would also point out that the board in relation to this kind of thing has resorted to workplace-specific criteria rather than process-specific criteria. For instance, Inco workers in Sudbury would be eligible for compensation for nickel-related diseases, but nickel exposure for workers in other fields would not be eligible unless proven, and hence you cannot have the police or the firefighters included in this particular piece of legislation.

Some will say that this bill is not necessary, that this is why schedule 3 is in the act and why do we not use that, and that the board of directors could easily amend the act to quickly include such obvious cases and then, of course, get cabinet approval for the amendment. That in itself takes time and would be speedy only if a majority of the workers on the board of directors agreed. It also does not account for the internal dynamics of the board itself. While it is true that adding to schedule 3 would be the simpler way of achieving the member for Simcoe Centre's purpose, the truth is that no additions to schedule 3 have been made since 1950, and even then, only 15. In terms of schedule 4, there have been no additions made by the board.

1050

I commend the member for bringing forth this amendment, but at the same time I feel very saddened that legislation seems the only route at this time. Hopefully, when the occupational disease task force reports back on Ontario's methodology and process of recognizing occupationally acquired diseases, and the Workers' Compensation Board acts on the report, amending the act by a private member's bill will no longer be necessary. There is a message here. When this bill is passed, the WCB will be alerted to seriously adding other categories to schedule 3.

Mr Lessard: I am rising to support the member for Simcoe Centre's bill as well. I know that there are a lot of people who may have some hesitations with expanding the scope of the Workers' Compensation Act. There are a lot of people who say that things are not working as well as they should be, and of course those are valid concerns at this point in time. There is much that has been said about the presumption and how that may be rebutted. I just wanted to indicate how important I feel that in rebutting this presumption or trying to—if this amendment does go through—the erosion of a person's right to privacy does not take place by persons who may say that there should be something like mandatory blood testing for those people who are working in health care facilities in order to determine whether they may have obtained a compensable disability as a result of their employment.

Many of these medical conditions take some time to incubate, and it is quite likely that people when they start their employment would not even know whether they had some of these types of diseases, so blood tests would not be a reasonable way or a bona fide way of being able to determine whether these conditions were apparent at a time people began their employment. We always have to keep in mind a person's right to privacy and also the fact that he should not need to be required to provide samples of his blood as a condition of obtaining his employment.

Mr Morrow: I stand in support of the private member's bill put forth by my colleague the member for Simcoe Centre. From my background in the labour movement I have been involved in matters of health and safety and I am honoured to speak today on amendments to the Workers' Compensation Act.

I am constantly reminded by my assistants that the Workers' Compensation Act requires several changes in legislation and policy. I am certain that our assistants, who administer the Workers' Compensation Board claims, would find it less complicated and more beneficial if changes were made to the Workers' Compensation Act. I believe this piece of legislation is a stepping-stone in making the Workers' Compensation Act more attractive to the citizens of Ontario.

Blood-borne pathogens pose an enormous threat to the safety of our health care workers. Subsequently, it is the potential transmission of these diseases that poses a threat to other citizens of the province. Since most of these diseases often are not detectable for periods of up to 36 months, it is critical that this legislation put the onus on the employer to prove that an employee did not contract the disease from the workplace, rather than have the employer prove that he or she contracted the disease from the workplace.

It would indeed be difficult for a health care worker to prove that he or she contracted a disease from a needle prick that occurred, say, six months previously. It is the employer's duty to provide workers with a safe place of employment. All hazards must be considered and where there is a potential hazard, protective equipment must be provided. Employees should be educated on these potential work-related risks. This is a basis of health and safety. If these checks fail, it is the duty of the government to support, console and, most important, compensate workers.

I see my time is running out, so I will close by saying that this legislation is both responsible and humane and, as I mentioned earlier, a step in the right direction to improving the much-flawed Workers' Compensation Act. I call on all members from both sides of this House to vote in favour of this bill.

Mr Wessenger: I would just like to deal with some of the issues raised. One of the questions that was raised was, why these specific diseases and where did they come from? They are the diseases that are recognized by the Centers for Disease Control in Atlanta, which is, I believe, one of the recognized leaders in the whole question of blood-borne diseases, so that is the basis of what diseases were included.

On the whole question with respect to why health care workers only, first of all I would like to state that by creating a rebuttable presumption we are not excluding other workers from benefits. The reason for including the health care workers is that the probability of establishing a cause-and-effect relationship between employment and occupational disease is highest in the health care profession, and we feel that these workers should be subject to a less onerous burden of proof and that therefore the onus should be placed on the employer. This is in fact borne out by the evidence that there have been cases in the health care area with respect to the whole question of HIV which had been established through the occupational.

Last, with respect to the whole question of what I would call the red herring raised by the member for Mississauga North with respect to the question of how privacy is going to be interfered with in the inquiry process, I would like to point out that right now a person can make a claim for proving industrial disease under the Workers' Compensation Act and has to go before a tribunal. That same inquiry would be made of the person making the claim whether there is a rebuttable presumption of proof or not. In my opinion, it is completely irrelevant as far as the inquiry into the individual is concerned. In fact, it would probably be just as onerous in both cases.

I therefore ask that members support this legislation as a spur to getting changes in the Workers' Compensation Act as a recognition of the high risk that health care workers face and the devastating effect of these particular illnesses.

LEAD ACID BATTERIES RECYCLING ACT, 1990

Mrs Sullivan moved second reading of Bill 26, An Act to require the Recycling of Lead Acid Batteries.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 94(c)(i), the honourable member has 10 minutes for her presentation.

Mrs Sullivan: The purpose of this bill is to require the recycling of lead acid batteries whether used in automotive or industrial applications. This bill is seen as a positive step forward by the Canadian Battery Manufacturers' Association, with whom I have consulted at some length, and follows the model of legislation which was developed by the Battery Council International. The BCI is an international not-for-profit trade association of companies whose members are involved in the manufacture, distribution and reclamation of lead batteries.

The BCI model has been accepted and implemented in 30 US states where it has been found to be practical and workable. It is the very pragmatic nature of this bill which I suggest makes it one which ought to be accepted by the government for implementation here.

The key points of the bill are: first, to prohibit any land disposal of a lead acid battery and mandate delivery to a retailer or some other agency in the battery recycling loop; second, to require retailers and other parts of the battery loop to take back spent batteries from customers at least equal to the number of new ones purchased; third, to require a posted, written notice informing the public about

the recycling of lead acid batteries; and fourth, to use fines as part of the enforcement provisions.

We know that lead batteries are a principal source of starting, lighting and igniting power for automobiles and boats. They are the sole power source for vehicles such as fork-lifts, golf carts and wheelchairs. Lead batteries also support a wide variety of backup power systems for computers and rechargeable products such as hand power tools. Backup power for hospitals and other institutions also relies on lead battery.

Lead batteries are readily recyclable and are in fact recycled today.

1100

An average battery available for recovery weighs about 36 pounds. It contains 18 pounds of recoverable lead, one gallon of sulphuric acid—about nine pounds—almost three pounds of polypropylene casing, about three pounds of polyvinyl chloride, PVCs, in the rubber separators and, finally, three pounds of sulphates and oxides to which the lead is bound.

Between 1975 and 1985, the average weight of batteries fell from 42 to 36 pounds. However, with new demands for cold-cranking power, the amount of lead has increased to an average of 22 pounds in those batteries. In the same period of time, the average battery lifetime has also increased by some 11% to close to three years.

Lead acid batteries enjoy high recycling rates today that are the envy of other materials. Market demand is not a problem. A well-developed infrastructure of lead smelters, battery breakers and battery manufacturers consumes all the batteries that are collected. This is a benefit not only to the manufacturer but to the environment as a whole.

But many people do not understand that batteries are readily recyclable and find alternative means for disposal, including placing them with their household waste for municipal pickup and landfill. The increasing concern over lead in the environment has put a greater focus on products and manufacturers that are associated with this toxic heavy metal. This bill is designed to close the loop and to capture those batteries which now miss the recycling circle.

In preparing this bill, I have had the assistance of battery manufacturers, retailers and trade associations, who have reviewed its provisions and commented on its content. I visited a battery factory to further understand the process and the follow-up after recycling.

Many legislatures in the United States have provided me with copies of their own legislation which has been enacted in their jurisdictions. I have been able to review legislation from many states, including Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Hawaii, North Carolina, Iowa, Tennessee, Maine, Florida, Louisiana, Wyoming, Oregon, Illinois, Connecticut and Minnesota. The majority of those states use the BCI model and adjust it to their local circumstances. Most report, as did the Department of Environmental Resources for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, that there have been, "no significant problem(s) with the procedure."

Many other states have adopted similar legislation, some including a deposit such as we see with bottle recycling. The US Environmental Protection Agency is now reviewing a

proposed federal bill that would make all battery legislation consistent through that country. Those states that I have named and who have recycling provisions for their lead acid batteries are our competitors. It seems to me that we should have no less environmental protection here than they do there.

I hope that this bill will be accepted by the House this morning. Similar legislation has proven to be effective in other jurisdictions and it should be enacted here. If accepted at second reading, any amendments which may improve the bill further can be put forward at a later stage of consideration.

Mr Speaker, I am going to reserve time to the end to speak further to this bill. I am urging members to accept Bill 26.

Mr Cousens: I would like to compliment the member for Halton Centre for presenting Bill 26. I will support it. I think what she is talking about is a natural evolution of concern to let's do the best we can with substances that we can keep out of landfill sites and find another purpose for. It is a start.

The concern I have is that it is too bad it did not come from this Agenda for People that the Minister of the Environment has been so proud of. I think the member has been very kind in her remarks, but I do not have to be. She is talking about a government that says it is everything to the environment, yet when it comes to coming up with specific legislation, this government has not—maybe the member can correct me—but I do not think that the new government has brought anything forward to this House on environmental legislation since it took power.

They have made all kinds of regulations outside the House. They make announcements outside the House that they are opposed to incineration. They come along with illogical ways in which they are going to handle the garbage. They say, "Well, we can ship the stuff from Kingston to Ottawa-Carleton but we can't do anything from Toronto to Kirkland Lake." We have a government that is really confused on its own agenda.

The Liberals at least have someone who is still alive, who is coming forward with an act to recycle lead acid batteries, and I compliment her for it. None the less, I would not want to leave this House today and let the honourable member think that it is a perfect bill, because it is not. I think there are a number of things that should be considered in its consideration.

Why not a provision, even though the member has addressed it in her remarks, for a deposit? It works with beer cans. Now that we get 10 cents a can, I think that people will even be picking them up on the beach and the side of the road because they can get a dime out of it. I do, and I do not think there is anything the matter with that. Any one of us—well, my Scottish background told us to be frugal and be careful and not to waste anything, and I will bend over for a penny if there is one on the road. Maybe that is why I am stooped over half the time.

I think we have got to do everything we can—when I look around this place, all there is is dirt from the NDP, so I do not want to keep my head too low.

Mr Perruzza: Aren't you being a little nasty this morning?

Mr Cousens: I am sorry. I did not mean to do that. There is always a certain offensive way that one has in describing the socialists that have taken over the province.

A deposit on batteries makes sense because if I can get a dime back, then that deposit is something I will go back for. It really does not matter what it is, if someone is going to go and look for that deposit. These young people up in the gallery know what it is when there is a deposit on pop bottles. They are inclined to use pop bottles rather than cans.

[Interruption]

Mr Cousens: This is to keep me quiet, I think. No, I cannot be bought off for that much.

The deposit provision is something that is worth looking at. It is a way in which we can encourage people who are not presently involved in the whole recycling program but who are looking for dollars. There are people who will then find a way of making a dollar out of collecting the old batteries.

I realize that is not part of the bill because you are not allowed to move batteries from one person to another. None the less, it means that industry and business will at least have a way of getting that money back and it will force the batteries into a recycling program.

The second thing is the collection facilities. I wish there was a greater definition of what the member really means by collection facilities. Maybe in her closing remarks she could elaborate on what she means by that.

My third point has to do with large batteries. When we think of a car battery, which is a lead battery, it is just a heavy, small battery about a foot square or smaller. Then you start getting into industrial batteries, which will also be covered by this legislation, which are a couple of tons in size. What does the honourable member suggest be done with those? I would think that they are already looked after and maybe there should be a special provision that deals with them.

Oh, oh, more money coming in. I am going to be on my knees today. I can just see it coming. I will go off the TV camera if I bend over for that coin.

Mr Perruzza: Bend over and pick it up.

Mr Cousens: No, I just do not want to miss the opportunity here.

I have one final issue. Why do we not begin to look at household batteries? I realize the batteries are one part of the equation, but household batteries become a matter of great concern when they end up either in incineration or in landfill sites or in anything. When you consider what they are full of, they are really full of toxic substances. When you look at the different kinds of batteries we have, zinc carbon batteries, alkaline manganese; the button cell batteries contain substances that if they are allowed to go into a landfill site—you have got lithium batteries. All I can say is that household batteries consist of a large number of different kinds of substances, and if those substances are allowed then to just break apart, end up in a landfill site, we are doing something in long-term damage to the environment.

Why not begin to look at a program that educates the public on what to do with their household batteries, what they use in a flashlight or their radio or anything else? If we did anything right, we would try to get people off batteries. If we could, we would find other ways of finding power, because when you look at the energy it takes to just have a rechargeable battery and some of these methods, if people could just hook up to an electrical line when they can rather than using batteries, we would have another way of solving this.

The automotive companies have spent millions of dollars to try to find substitute power for gasoline. They have come up with different kinds of batteries. Let us continue to invest in research to find other methods of power. We have got solar power; we have got other kinds of power. Why can we not do more in this?

The small calculators that we use now are energized by light. Maybe I am opening up another can of worms because I do not know enough about it because it is another kind of battery, but are there other forms of energy that we could be using that will have no or a more limited negative effect on the environment over the long term?

1110

That becomes a question that this government could begin to address with some of the moneys that are coming in from other forms of taxation which could then go out to fund it. The Ministry of the Environment has picked up over \$150 million just on the tire tax which has not been spent. I personally would take a certain amount of pleasure in seeing some of that money invested in research and development, to find ways of protecting the environment in the long term.

None the less, there are many other things to be said. I am most fortunate in having the member for Mississauga South, who is a learned person on environmental matters, who will be speaking on this issue as well. I wanted to share part of the time with her in response to this bill.

The bill is a beginning. It is too bad it did not originate from the most honourable Minister of the Environment. That is where some of this leadership was expected to be coming from, but instead it comes from the remnants of the Liberals. We will take it wherever it comes from. We are willing to support these things because we believe in it and it is right. I thank the honourable member for at least making an effort. Who knows what is going to happen? If it is a whip vote, it might be defeated, but at least we will be in support of it from the Progressive Conservative side of the House.

Mrs Mathysen: I rise today to speak to private member's Bill 26, introduced by the honourable member for Halton Centre. First, I would like to say that the Minister of the Environment would have liked to have been here today, but unfortunately her schedule did not permit her to be present. As her parliamentary assistant, she has asked me to speak to the bill.

After reviewing Bill 26, An Act to require the Recycling of Lead Acid Batteries, I would like to commend the member for Halton Centre for putting forth creative solu-

tions for the disposal and recycling of these lead acid batteries which are primarily used in cars and trucks.

As all members of this House are fully aware, the Minister of the Environment has enunciated her aggressive 3Rs waste reduction strategy. I am pleased that the member opposite has shown by her efforts today the realization that we must all work together to achieve this. This bill is an example of our ability to do so.

I am pleased to say today that I support this bill in principle and will vote in favour of its passage at second reading. However, I do have serious reservations about the finer points of this proposed legislation.

It is simply common sense for all of us to recycle our old used car and truck batteries. By doing so, we do indeed reduce the waste going into landfills. We must develop a conserver society. Recycling our old batteries not only reduces the amount of waste that ends up in our landfills but also promotes the development of secondary industries. Old batteries, while not functional in our vehicles, are still of great value.

Evidence of the worth of old batteries can be found in the fact that several recycling facilities already exist for lead acid batteries. Old batteries mean profit for those who are in the recycling business, and we have certainly come to a point in our history when we must stop thinking of products that no longer serve our needs as garbage. We must now understand the value of our formerly discarded products and make a conscious effort to thoughtlessly discard them no more.

While we must ensure continued recycling of our old batteries, we must also ensure that lead acid battery recycling facilities meet the stringent standards of existing environmental legislation. One of my chief concerns with the proposed legislation before us this morning is the fact that it only deals with one specific product. Passage of the bill in its present form would set a precedent for legislation on a product-by-product basis.

I think this approach, especially at this time, is not the direction we should be taking. It would, in my opinion, be a mistake. While I agree that recycling of car and truck batteries is a step that we must certainly take, I would also point out that a more comprehensive waste reduction-recycling strategy would be more effective.

Another concern I have is the fact that this bill is aimed primarily at the consumer. The onus of compliance is placed squarely upon the shoulders of the consumer of the product. While it is true that we must all take responsibility for the protection of our environment, I do not believe that the responsibility lies only with the consumer.

The honourable Minister of the Environment has stated that industry must take the lead in product stewardship. What this means is that industry must ultimately be responsible for the products that it produces, especially when these products have the potential to damage the land on which we live, the air which we breathe and the water that sustains us.

This bill fails to address the issue of industry product stewardship. I would like to have seen such an inclusion from the member for Halton Centre. It is essential that all members of our society understand and put into action the

3Rs: reduce, reuse and recycle, and this includes recycling lead acid batteries.

Despite the fact that I have numerous reservations with regard to the proposed legislation, I agree wholeheartedly with the basic principle put forth. For this reason, I will support the bill from the member for Halton Centre.

Mr McGuinty: I take pleasure in supporting the bill introduced by the member for Halton Centre and I want to compliment her, not only for having introduced the bill but also for the excellent research that went into developing it, and in particular on the advantage she has taken of experiences gained in other jurisdictions, particularly the American jurisdictions.

I do not think any of us here can fail to recognize and understand the important role that the 3Rs can play in terms of reducing waste in the province. Reducing, reusing and recycling are now well known to all of us here and to, I am sure, our population in Ontario. What this bill does is it provides us with an opportunity to put into practice one of the 3Rs, and that is recycling. It deals with a particular form of pollution, lead and acid batteries.

Now, criticisms have been levelled at the bill as a result of its failure to be more encompassing, at the fact that it is not comprehensive in terms of its approach with batteries and, further, that it is not comprehensive in dealing with other forms of pollution which also could be addressed in a similar manner. That is a legitimate criticism. However, if we are to approach all problems on an omnibus basis, problems which arise in this House and particularly problems relating to pollution, whenever we delay something, damage is continuing to occur in the interim.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, are we prepared to allow this damage to occur? I think the priority we must lend to our approach to all pollution is one which leads us to deal with it effectively at the earliest possible opportunity. That is what this bill is attempting to do and I think it will successfully do so if we give it a chance.

The parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment raised a concern that industry must take primary responsibility for dealing with the problems created by forms of pollution, and she made reference to a phrase the minister has used a number of times, "industry product stewardship." There is some legitimacy to that concern raised by the parliamentary assistant, but I would reply that our greatest strength in this province in terms of dealing with pollution lies with the individuals and not with government or business.

This places a responsibility not only on individuals, the consumers, but on the retailers, manufacturers and distributors. It provides a comprehensive approach to a specific problem and I think it deals with it in a very effective way. In fact, all of those groups are charged with special responsibility under the terms of this legislation and the theme that is evident here is that everyone has a role to play.

Another very attractive feature of the bill is that it creates a closed-loop system. I guess it is a variation on the cradle-to-grave theory and it effectively, again, deals with the product from the onset of purchase until it returns into the hands of the appropriate party who can deal with the product.

1120

Something I would encourage the member for Halton Centre to do is to ensure that ultimately when this bill meets with success, communications, and particularly those that are going to be made to the public, to the consumer, the retailer, the manufacturer, are given some time in order to ensure that people are not caught off guard with respect to this legislation.

The member for Markham, I believe, made reference to deposits. It is my understanding that the deposit approach—that is, where a deposit will be paid on the battery, in return for the spent battery at a later date the deposit will be returned—has been less than successful, given the experience of other jurisdictions, particularly American jurisdictions. Although he has raised a valid point, I think that experience has shown—and it is no longer necessary for us to reinvent the wheel on this particular case—that it was proven that this approach is more successful than the deposit approach.

I think we should recognize too—I have mentioned this before and the member for Halton Centre did—that given the experience this type of legislation has met with in other jurisdictions, particularly American jurisdictions—it is my understanding this bill has been put into effect in one form or another in 30 of the states—It is based on a model bill which was put forward by the Battery Council International and this bill has been endorsed by the Canadian Battery Manufacturers' Association. So all of those factors, I think, commend themselves to us.

In closing, I would recommend that this bill be given very careful consideration. I am very pleased to hear that the Minister of the Environment is going to consent to the passage of this bill on second reading. I assume that she will be making her reservations known more fully to us when third reading comes around, but I am sure that the member for Halton Centre, if I can go out on a bit of a limb here, is open to improvements to her bill. I do not think any of us have laid claim to perfection in terms of our ability to draft legislation which will meet all of the needs in specific area, and I am sure that the same would apply here.

I think I have said all I can in terms of providing intelligent contribution to this debate and—

Interjections.

Mr McGuinty: Members should shout some ideas over here. Perhaps I can end on this note: I think the most appealing element of this legislation again is this principle of the closed loop and the fact that it provides a comprehensive approach in terms of dealing with a particular problem and I lend my wholehearted support to it.

Mrs Marland: It gives me pleasure to rise this morning in support of this bill. I would like to say at the outset however that the member who introduced this bill to the House represents a party which, for the five years that it was the government, did not respond to my suggestions that we have mandatory battery recycling.

If the members would listen to the comments, then they will understand that the rebuttal which usually follows, "Well, you were the government for 42 years; you

didn't do that," I want to tell members that when we were the government, first of all, the technology that now exists did not exist then, and even so, in 1979, which is the latest figures that are accurate about recycling this type of lead, these kind of batteries were recycled to the maximum of 90% of the batteries produced.

I think the incentive of the bill is great. I think if anyone wanted to research Hansard for the last five years, he or she would have heard me asking the Minister of the Environment of the Liberal government to initiate recycling of batteries and to encourage the use of rechargeable batteries. In fact, I remember one day specifically suggesting in a preamble to one of my questions that we should have a once-a-month, routine dropoff in schools of all the other types of batteries, because first of all, it would be an educational experience for children to start to recognize that with all their toys and games and the small appliances which are used in their homes that are battery-operated, if they do not have rechargeable batteries, then there has to be a safe disposal for their batteries as well. That suggestion to the Liberal government was never picked up.

So I think it is great that this bill is here this morning at the initiative of the Liberal Party, and of course as an environmentalist, I support it wholly. I think we have to be sure that we make an amendment to this bill when it comes back to the House or to committee to ensure that there is an incentive, because at the moment the recycling of any batteries containing lead is limited to the market requirement for the end product.

I noticed in the bill it refers to secondary lead smelters. Now, there are only five in Canada. One of those secondary lead smelters is in my riding. It is also an operation that has done in the past a great deal of damage to the environment from the process of recycling those batteries. They are now, with new equipment and new regulations and enforcement by the ministry, down to 99.98% efficiency in terms of trying to achieve zero discharge. However, zero discharge is not going to be possible with recycling of these batteries. But frankly I think the control of where these batteries go is more important than the deterrent of the fact that we cannot achieve zero discharge in the process of their recycling.

I think when we are looking at something as heavy as automobile batteries, we have to be very sure that whatever the regulations are to implement this bill, they are very practical. There are a whole lot of people who are simply not able to carry a 25-pound battery into a store when they go to buy their new one, and they are dependent on the person in the store to take the new one out to their vehicle.

I think the limitation about not transferring one battery from one consumer to another should be closely looked at, because the fact that you would have to bring a battery in to buy another one is perhaps going to be difficult to enforce if that is the thrust behind a regulation following this bill. Obviously a lot of people take their batteries out of their cars and put them in their boats and therefore there are other uses that they give to a battery for which the purpose in their car has been completed.

I think also that with this bill the government should look at increasing the market for the end product so that the incentive can be there because of the value of these used batteries. Unless there is a market at the end, then we do not have an incentive for anyone to comply with those regulations, and obviously the policing would be very difficult. When you think about the fact that a battery contains almost a gallon of sulphuric acid, it is pretty scary stuff if you think about what happens to those batteries when they are not properly disposed of. I think when we look at the record of where we are currently, with only 50% to 55% of all batteries being disposed of safely, obviously something has to be done to reverse that trend.

1130

I think also that when we even look at a good secondary lead smelter and, as I said a few minutes ago, consider the risks of what happens in that process and recognize that the gas that is emitted is a greenhouse gas, we have got to be very sure that where these recycled batteries end up is a safe alternative. Landfilling them is not a safe alternative, but also secondary lead smelters have to be very closely monitored to make sure, because there are a lot of batteries, that we are not simply lowering the standards. As long as everything is conducted within close guidelines, it will work.

Mr Drainville: I am glad to be able to rise in the House today in support of Bill 26, which has been brought forward by the member for Halton Centre. I want to say also that we are always in a bit of a dilemma when we see on all sides of the House, when resolutions, motions and bills come forward, the difficulty on the part of individual members as they raise these issues. There are often parts of the bills that we can quibble with, that we do not think go far enough or we do not agree with, and that is the case of course with this bill, as it is with most of those motions. But I want to say that despite the fact that there are some things—and I will talk about them in a moment—still I believe that this bill is something that is worthy of passing in the House. I certainly will support it and I would ask other members to do the same.

Under this bill it would be unlawful for a consumer to "dispose of a battery except by delivery to a battery manufacturer, a battery retailer, a battery wholesaler, a secondary lead smelter or a collection facility designated by the director." The other thing that I think is good about this bill is that it says that there can be no emissions that flow from the battery either into the air or the water.

I want to talk about why those things are important. First of all, recycling, as we know, is an absolute priority with this government. The Minister of the Environment has been clear about the need for us to move in the direction of the 3Rs that we have put forward. We are supportive also of the fact that this bill prevents a resource being lost to waste. Also, it is important that we as consumers, and this bill helps to provide for this, have the opportunity to take seriously our role in society, that we have to know the effects of our consumption. So it puts the onus on the consumer here. The proposed bill is very stringent, and I

say "stringent" in the sense that it prohibits emissions in the disposal of these batteries, and that is a good thing.

In terms of some of the negatives that we see in this bill, I must say that it is a difficulty today, as we look at the environmental problems that we have, that much of the onus more and more is being put on consumers. That is a good thing because, as I say, we have to take responsibility for our environment and our role in society. But I have to caution the members here, and also caution my own government, that we need to be clear about the role of producers and manufacturers. We need to ensure that there are enough attempts to ensure the producers and manufacturers themselves take seriously the environment, that when we produce things that are potentially hazardous to the environment we are not helping our community or society, and in these terms the bill does not really deal with that kind of issue. That is a concern I have and so I would raise that problem.

Section 2 of the bill talks about the disposal of the battery. It does not really go into any great definition of disposal of the battery and I think that needs clarification. I would hope that perhaps in the future, either through the Minister of the Environment or through another bill, we might have that spelled out, because there are many ways of disposal and I think that needs to be focused on.

I also want to say that in terms of section 13, the fine of \$500, I really believe that is not a particular help, that it is too small a sum of money. Our environment is so important that if we are going to establish penalties and attempt to monitor the kinds of infractions that may occur, there has to be some sense in which we are going to make a strong statement when anyone breaches the law. I think we need to increase the penalty.

On the whole, those are the main remarks I want to make. I want to applaud the honourable member for Halton Centre and indicate how much I appreciate her bringing forth this bill. I again say that I will support it and ask my fellow members of caucus to support it as well.

Mr McClelland: It is a pleasure to stand here. I might at the outset indicate my disappointment that the member for Ottawa South could not continue at length. We were all riveted to every word and turn of phrase that he was issuing forth today. Notwithstanding our encouragement for him to continue, he found it necessary to conclude his remarks, and for that I am sorry.

I am not here necessarily to join in any rebuttal with respect to my friend the member for Mississauga South. She raised the issue of mandatory recycling. I think, though, it bears some comment. Very briefly, I wanted simply to say that is an issue that I think deserves to be considered and revisited again from time to time. Simply let me say that the philosophy of the previous administration, since the member for Mississauga South raised it, was that very much was being done in general terms with respect to recycling. Indeed, the tremendous response from all communities across this province was indicative of that, and I think the willingness of communities and, more important, the citizens of this province to get involved in recycling speaks for itself.

One of the things that my friend the member for Victoria-Haliburton mentioned was that there are always, in any bill—none of us is perfect and anything, therefore, that we craft requires change from time to time. Indeed, one of the strengths of this whole process is that collectively we assist one another in refining and improving and adding on and making changes as necessary and as deemed advisable by the majority of members who are present at any given time. I am pleased that he is prepared and has stood in his place and said that he will be supporting it, together with his colleagues on the government side, because indeed in so doing, if this would move forward to the appropriate committee, amendments that I am sure would be very helpful would be forthcoming from members such as the member for Victoria-Haliburton and others, and in so doing would build on the basic principle of this bill, which I think is laudatory.

I might add that one of the things that my colleagues on all three sides of the House have not mentioned as an integral component of this bill is the issue of communications. A lot of people do not know what they can do. I meet from time to time with citizens' groups, as we all do, and meet with students, and they will say, "What can I do to help?" In fact, I know that a number of members opposite have done some very fine work—on all sides of the House, for that matter—and sent out householders to their constituents and said, "The environment, how can I help?" And they articulate a series of items that we can do in our households from day to day to assist, in practical terms, the improvement of our environment and the preservation of our environment for generations to come.

This bill has a communications component built into it that I think is very, very important, because it identifies the potential. It very clearly has standard signage that allows the consumer at the point of purchase, and subsequently built into the process of the recycling of the batteries, to become aware of what they can do.

1140

I need not go into some of the difficulty created by the inappropriate disposal of lead batteries. Many members, particularly the members from the Durham region—I notice that our friend the member for Durham Centre is here today—would be well aware of the tremendous difficulty with respect to the development of Canada Homes with the inappropriate disposal of lead batteries. A generation later, the health and the wellbeing of an innocent community was put into jeopardy because batteries were inappropriately disposed of. The pollution, the poisoning of soil that is caused by the inappropriate disposal of lead batteries is just tremendous in its magnitude.

The other difficulty, of course, is that lead migrates from place to place as it percolates through the soil, given the water tables, and is very, very hard to trace. Environment is not only a dollars-and-cents issue but is a very real issue, because it depletes resources that would otherwise be available for the things that we need to do. The cost of cleanup of lead contamination is simply astronomical. We are literally into the millions upon millions upon millions of dollars to clean up lead-contaminated soil. Moreover, it has been clearly indicated by those in the scientific community

that lead contamination has a tremendous debilitating effect upon the mental capacity of young people, that it in fact impairs cognitive skills. Lead poisoning has that effect. So I really believe that the substance of this bill is to be pursued and to be pursued rigorously.

I would like to indicate one small point. I had asked my research assistant, the member for Ottawa South, to provide me some information, which he has just done. The member for Victoria-Haliburton indicated that he felt the fine was too low. It is my understanding that the limit for the Provincial Offences Act was \$500. I am wrong. My friend from Ottawa South indicates that the maximum fine under the Provincial Offences Act is in fact \$2,000. I would simply say that is indicative of the constructive nature of this kind of debate. The member opposite has brought to our attention something that could in fact be changed. It is the kind of amendment that I would encourage my friend to bring forward should this proceed to committee, as I believe it will and ought to do.

Let me say one thing in conclusion: People will say from time to time, "What difference does it make in the grand scheme of things?" I am not here, and do not have the opportunity, to go into the vast difficulty that can be attributed to lead contamination. The magnitude, both in terms of potential harm and the scope of lead contamination of our soil and water through lead batteries, is just profound, it is absolutely incredible. But people want to do something. People in Brampton North, in my constituency, want to make a difference; people in Victoria-Haliburton want to make a difference; in Middlesex; in Halton.

Mr Carr: In Oakville South.

Mr McClelland: In Oakville South, my friend says. I think people across this province want to make a difference. Does it make a difference? Yes, it does. This is not my illustration, but I borrow from a good friend of mine who recently was talking about the little things that we can do. He said: "You know, if you grab a snowflake in your hand it's not very much. It's pretty fragile and it melts. It doesn't amount to much. But if you put enough of them together they can shut down traffic and stop planes from flying." If we begin to do things a little bit at a time, if the 9.2 million or 9.3 million people in this province do the little bit that we can, together it becomes very, very significant.

Moreover, I look at the pages who are sitting in front of Mr Speaker and the kind of world that we are going to leave for them. The responsibility that I have, the responsibility that each one of us has and the people whom we represent, I think, is significantly addressed through the legislation that has been put forward. I commend the member for having put forward this bill. My colleague the member for Halton Centre has done a lot of good work with this. We are delighted to speak in support of it and wish her well as it proceeds to committee and is improved with the constructive input of my friends opposite.

Mr Lessard: I too am rising to support this bill. The reason I am doing that is because I am firmly in support of efforts to recycle, reduce and reuse. I support this bill, however, with some reservations, one of them being that this bill only deals with one issue, and that is the recycling

of lead acid batteries. I am not sure the recycling of these types of batteries really is something that is a significant problem, without having a bill to deal with it.

It has always been my belief, and maybe it is not correct, that used batteries have valuable materials in them and are desired by companies that are involved in lead smelting and for that reason are collected by them. Something that concerns me is that at one time, my friend the member for Huron tells me \$5 was paid for people who turned in their old batteries, because these were items that were collected by persons who wanted the materials in them.

I think, rather than having mandatory incentives placed on people who are going to be dealing with batteries, that this incentive should come about some other way. I say that because the bill sets up what looks like a complicated process to deal with what may not be a serious problem, that is, reusing materials that are in used batteries. It seems to me that there are more problems involved with the storage of these types of batteries and that does not really seem to be addressed in the bill.

It was mentioned earlier about contamination of land from lead and this bill, in subsection 2(4), indicates that you cannot dispose of a battery in such a manner that chemicals may be emitted into the air or water, but it does not deal with contamination of land. That is something that causes me some concern.

I do agree with the comments that were made by my friend the member for Markham, who indicates that he is concerned about other types of batteries. Specifically batteries that we need to be concerned about are ones that are used in flashlights and lots of small electronic appliances and gadgets that are so popular these days, and those generally have mercury in them. I know it is a problem down in my area because of the Detroit incinerator being across the river.

My friends in the opposition will know about the problems that have been caused by that. In fact, a lawsuit was commenced against the state of Michigan because of the problems from the incinerator, and mercury contamination is a serious problem in emissions from that incinerator, to a great extent because of batteries that are incinerated there. I think we need to pay some attention to those types of batteries as well and that there does need to be some sort of incentive to deal with those.

Mr Mills: I do not want to speak at great length because I realize that the honourable member for Halton Centre wants to wrap up. I would just like to congratulate her on bringing forth this Bill 26.

I find, on Thursday mornings, being here when we debate private members' bills is so exhilarating to me. I often wonder whether perhaps this is the way governments should be run, because we all seem to have such wonderful ideas and it almost makes me use the analogy of being in church. The best part of being in church is to get the opportunity to sing and the best part of being here on Thursday is that we get to debate these wonderful, sensible suggestions that all parties bring forward.

I know that I am very glad to see the retailer has to take back the battery. In my own circumstances, I had a battery

installed a short while ago and I drove the car home and I thought he had taken the battery. I opened the trunk and there was the battery. We wonder what to do with these things, and I am sure this is repeated all over the province. I have a battery now at the back of my shed, and I am sure there are thousands and thousands of people like me who have batteries polluting the earth and the soil all over the province at the backs of their respective sheds.

I congratulate the member. It is not often that I can stand here and support Liberal ideas, but today I am very pleased to stand here and support her.

1150

Mrs Sullivan: I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to the members who have put their thoughtful comments relating to this bill before the House today and to thank them also for their support. There are some points that I want to address in remarks that have been made.

The member for Markham and the member for Windsor-Walkerville both spoke relating to the deposit system, which may be something we ought to be looking at. I have looked at that alternative, and one of the things that drew me to leave that particular alternative out of this bill was that this bill must be implemented all across Ontario.

As a consequence, we are looking at an industry-specific situation where a deposit, particularly for small retailers and particularly for those in communities that are smaller than Toronto, may increase cost, may increase the bureaucratic paper burden for the retailer and make it more difficult for that retailer to participate. We have also looked at statistical data from the United States experience and discovered that in fact where there is a deposit system, it does not work as well as where there is not.

The member for Markham asked me to be more specific about the collection facilities. I think we understand that because of the industry-specific nature of the bill, we are looking at a situation where indeed there is a collection cycle. It begins with the customer who may be an industrial or a retail customer and proceeds right back to the manufacturer. That is a long-term process and one which is very efficient.

I hope that when the vote is taken, it will pass. I believe that we can improve the bill in committee as it is taken forward and that it will become a good part of our legislation in Ontario.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION
AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL

The Deputy Speaker: We will deal first with ballot item 13 standing in the name of Mr Wessenger. If any members are opposed to a vote on this ballot item, will they please rise. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

All those in favour will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Pursuant to standing order 94(f), the recorded vote on this ballot item is deferred.

LEAD ACID BATTERIES RECYCLING ACT, 1990

The Deputy Speaker: Mrs Sullivan has moved second reading of Bill 26.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 94(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mrs Sullivan: I request that it be sent to the resources development committee.

The Deputy Speaker: It has been requested that the bill go to the resources development committee. Agreed?

Mrs Haslam: No.

The Deputy Speaker: No. All those in favour of this question will please rise and remain standing. All those opposed will please rise.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Mr Speaker, there is not a majority.

The Deputy Speaker: The majority of the House not being in agreement with the request of the member, this bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

1200

WORKERS' COMPENSATION
AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI
SUR LES ACCIDENTS DU TRAVAIL

The House divided on Mr Wessenger's motion for second reading of Bill 68, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Wessenger pour la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 68, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour—38

Abel, Boyd, Bradley, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Fletcher, Frankford, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lessard, Martel, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., O'Connor, Owens, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Waters, Wessenger, White, Wilson, G., Wiseman, Wood.

Nays/Contre—17

Arnott, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Fawcett, Harnick, Jordan, Marland, Offer, Sullivan, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Bill ordered for committee of the whole House.

Le projet de loi est déféré au comité plénier de la Chambre.

The Deputy Speaker: Mr White, you are not in your seat, I believe.

Mr White: I have already voted, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: No, but you were not in your seat. You are to vote in your seat.

Mr White: I am in my seat, sir.

The Deputy Speaker: I agree, thank you.

Mr White: On a point of personal privilege, Mr Speaker: My seat has been moved from here to here.

The Deputy Speaker: But you cannot move as you vote. You cannot move from one seat to another until you vote. That applies to everyone; as simple as that. These are the procedures.

LEAD ACID BATTERIES RECYCLING ACT, 1990

Mrs Sullivan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It is my understanding that some of the members in relationship to the vote on disposal of Bill 26 did not understand that having the bill in committee of the whole meant that there could not be witnesses brought before members to discuss the content of that bill. I wonder if we could have

unanimous consent of the House to take that vote again so that it can be referred to the standing committee on resources development.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?
No.

Hon Miss Martel: If I might, Mr Speaker, there will be government business going to that committee in the very near future, and that is why I am not referring it to that particular committee.

The House recessed at 1205.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

BROADCAST OF QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Daigeler: For some unknown reason, TVOntario decided a few weeks ago to broadcast Ontario Question Period after midnight. This change is regrettable indeed. Some Ontarians may still stay up past midnight to watch Question Period on television. Most people, I suspect, though, will be in deep slumber by then. Poor program timing will deprive them, therefore, of a great opportunity to learn first hand about provincial politics.

For the three years that I was a member of the governing party, Question Period was always broadcast between 11 and 12 pm. This was late enough but still reasonable for people going to work the next day. In fact, over the years I have met many constituents who mentioned how often they followed the Queen's Park proceedings on television and how much they enjoyed them.

Why did TVOntario change this practice? Does it have anything to do with the new government's inexperience in handling public accountability? Who made this unfortunate decision and on what advice?

I will send a copy of this statement to the chairman of TVOntario and ask him to explain. But I will do more. I will urge Mr Ostry to reinstate the usual broadcasting hours for Queen's Park question period.

GEORGE LAWRENCE

Mr Turnbull: I am pleased to stand in the House today to recognize one of my constituents, George Lawrence. George received the first ALS Ontario Esmond Butler Volunteer Award from the Governor General on Tuesday 23 April as their volunteer of the year.

ALS, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, is more commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease, after the famous baseball player who died of it. It is a relentlessly progressive, irreversible disease of the nervous system. It has been said that having ALS is like being buried alive.

George Lawrence, an ALS patient himself, has held many executive positions with the society and is currently president of the Metro Toronto society. He was the sparkplug behind the Buried Alive public awareness campaign for ALS in 1987-88. In 1987, George was responsible for starting the National Iron Man Luncheon to honour the Blue Jay who best exemplifies the characteristics of good sportsmanship and gentlemanliness of Lou Gehrig. Although George lives with the effects of ALS every day, he devotes all of his time and energy to publicizing the disease and helping others cope with its debilitating effects.

I would ask the House today to join with me in recognizing Mr Lawrence for his courage and sense of responsibility to the disabled community. He is a concerned humanitarian and I congratulate him on his award.

DAY OF MOURNING

Mr O'Connor: It is my privilege to rise today and announce that the Durham Regional Labour Council is sponsoring a march on Sunday 28 April, which is labour's day of mourning for workers killed, disabled or injured while they were on the job.

Just two days ago, the member for Leeds-Grenville told this House that he did not like workers having a chance to be a part of the changes at the Workers' Compensation Board.

Well, I came from a plant to this House to represent all the people from my riding, including the workers. I hope that I speak for all the members in this House as we make a strong commitment to health and safety in the workplace.

Durham labour council wants 28 April to be an annual day of mourning to remember all Canadians killed, disabled or injured in the workplace and workers afflicted with industrial disease. The Durham Regional Labour Council will begin its march at 10:30 am Sunday at the United Steelworkers hall at 115 Albert Street in Oshawa. They will march to city hall, where there will be one minute of silence, the flag will be lowered and the official ceremony will take place.

I am proud to have been part of the labour movement in Ontario. I am proud to be here today to honour the men and women who have been killed, injured or disabled while in the workplace.

CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY OF YORK REGION

Mr Beer: On 24 April, 12 members of the York Region Children's Aid Society resigned. Effectively, this community-run agency will no longer carry out its operating mandate, to protect the children and support the families of York region.

This dramatic decision was taken in direct response to inadequate government funding. The York Region Children's Aid Society has refused to take responsibility for the funding decisions taken by the Minister of Community and Social Services. York region is the lowest-funded CAS in the province on a per capita and a per child basis, yet it serves the fifth-largest population base in Ontario. This year the minister has allocated \$900,000 less than the York region CAS needs to meet its obligations to children.

Children's aid societies are in a unique position in this province. They are mandated to investigate allegations of abuse and to protect our children when necessary. These are functions that they are required by provincial statute to carry out.

The minister's inaction has sent a message to children's aid societies across the province, some 46 of which are forecasting a deficit this year. She has shown that she does not place value on their work.

Earlier this week we heard that the impasse in funding for Metro child care had been resolved because the minister said she would consider the actual cost of providing child care services in Metro when calculating funding.

The children's aid societies ask for nothing more than the same treatment. It is time the minister placed some importance on their work and recognized the actual cost of

providing child welfare services in Ontario and funded societies to that level. The place to begin is York region.

POLICE SERVICES

Mr J. Wilson: My statement is directed to the Solicitor General. On 27 March, during the early hours of the morning, Village Pharmacy in the village of Creemore was burglarized and a large quantity of narcotics was stolen. Three weeks later, on 18 April, a similar burglary occurred at roughly the same time and at the same pharmacy in Creemore.

Much to his shock and dismay, the owner of the pharmacy, John Smart, was told that there was no 24-hour police coverage for the village. Through no fault of their own, members of the Stayner OPP detachment, which polices the village of Creemore, go off duty and go on call for a three-hour period.

Not only is the Solicitor General aware of this policing shortfall, but so are the criminals in the area, who are making their rounds regularly after officers go off duty. Because the town of Stayner and the village of Creemore represent the gateway to the four-season Georgian Triangle tourist area, the amount of traffic in this district is tremendous and the need for a fully staffed police force is acute.

Residents in the Stayner-Creemore area deserve full value for their tax dollars, and this does not translate into part-time policing. The Ontario government must move quickly to re-establish effective deterrents for our policing system. What is in place to deter crime when budget and staffing shortages force the OPP to cut policing forces, resulting in criminals running wild the moment the officers go off duty?

I want the Solicitor General to address this staffing deficiency and send a clear message to victimized residents in my riding that Ontario's police forces are on duty 24 hours a day. My constituents and the people of rural Ontario deserve nothing less.

RECYCLING

Mr Drainville: I am pleased to announce that two organizations in the riding of Victoria-Haliburton have been recognized for their outstanding efforts in reducing the amount of garbage reaching our ever-expanding dumps.

It seems to me that the key to the success of their efforts is to think of waste materials as goods ready to be reused and not as garbage. If we as individuals and organizations start thinking and acting like these award winners, then the garbage crisis will become a thing of the past.

John's Cartage Ltd of Lindsay was selected as an outstanding recycling program operator. The recycling operations only started in 1988, but since then it has moved forward by expanding and automating its operation even in tough economic times.

Winning the outstanding community under 20,000 is the town of Lindsay. This town has achieved an incredible 27.2% waste diversion in its blue box program alone. In addition, there is the Student Action for Recycling program in area schools and the pickups of fine paper and corrugated cardboard from local businesses. Mixed plastics, tires, batteries and scrap metal are separated out for recycling. Composters

are provided for backyards, and leaves and Christmas trees are collected for composting and shredding.

I am proud of my community of Lindsay and the two awards that have been given, both to the town of Lindsay and to John's Cartage.

1340

CONSERVATION

Mr Ramsay: We have every reason to expect that the budget may severely handicap a very important initiative for private land habitat conservation.

The Conservation Land Act, also known as the "untaxing nature program," was introduced on 14 December 1987. It provides tax relief to owners of valuable natural habitat, such as wetlands, areas of natural and scientific interest and non-revenue-producing conservation authority lands.

This act and its funding program were universally applauded by every group with an interest in natural habitat protection in this province. Organizations such as the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the Conservation Council of Ontario, conservation authorities, the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, the Sierra Club, Pollution Probe, and municipalities, individual farmers, birders, hunters and other concerned citizens saw this as a most positive initiative. This even included the Minister of Natural Resources in his role as critic.

We expect there might be some reduction in this rebate program, and consequently less incentive to protect these important pieces of Ontario's natural heritage will exist.

Clearly, the benefits of this program far outweigh the costs, and tampering with this program is not environmentally friendly. Any cuts to this program would be unwise and would serve as a clear indication of the desperation of this government and its lack of commitment to conservation and habitat protection.

Don't do it, Floyd.

TAXATION

Mr Stockwell: We have received hundreds and hundreds of faxes from our Fax Floyd campaign, and I am sure—

Interjections.

Mr Stockwell: Obviously it has the inmates slightly excited. I am sure they would like to hear some of the interesting comments that the constituents of Ontario have made to our Treasurer:

"Balance the budget, don't use the recession as an excuse."

"I'm fed up with working for the government."

"The NDP government should listen to the taxpayers."

"Please, no more taxes."

"It has to stop. We can't pay any more."

"Leaving Ontario, due to high taxes."

"Fed up with the permanent job losses."

"Also ticked off with nutty fringe appointments."

"I'd strongly advise your workers and unionists to stop or you'll end up with no business in this province and the workers won't earn enough to pay their union dues."

"Enough is enough! Can't you feel it's out of control? Slow down and put your house in order."

"The Ontario government must cut its own spending drastically, even if this means layoffs."

"Government must also become far more efficient. Unless absolutely necessary, programs must be slashed. Taxes cannot increase."

"It's difficult to stretch retirement dollars any further."

"Rae has already shown himself to be just like Peterson. Quite a feat in only 6 months."

"You're perhaps even worse than those dreaded Libs."

EARTH DAY

Mr G. Wilson: Although Earth Day was well recognized in this House on Monday, I would like to acknowledge the efforts made in my riding to mark the day, but second, I wish to remind members that the quest for environmental sanity is a continuing campaign. We must remember that the 1990s have been called the decade for the environment.

Participants in the week-long Earth Day activities in my riding came from all sectors of the community, including business, developmental, labour, educational and political.

But perhaps the highlight of this year's celebration was the introduction of the Earth Day/Everyday Home Audit. This questionnaire will be distributed to enough households in Kingston to provide a model for similar-sized communities across Canada in their attempts to be more environmentally responsible. This project is the initiative of Sandra Beattie, co-ordinator of Earth Day Kingston.

The Earth Day/Everyday Home Audit was developed by environmental experts to help each of us reduce our personal impact on the environment. It is designed to enable Earth Day Canada to chart our progress and to deliver the tangible results our individual environmental actions create. When the audit is returned to Earth Day Canada, it will assess your household's position in the environmental spectrum. Based on this assessment, Earth Day Canada will give usable information on simple ways to reduce your environmental impact without any radical changes in your lifestyle. The program will help save money while it helps preserve Canada's natural resources.

Everyone makes a difference. By including all our citizens in environmental awareness programs, we will build the support for the social changes we must make to save our planet.

VISITORS

The Speaker: Members may wish to welcome to our gallery and to our chamber this afternoon the federal member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke Ontario, Len Hopkins, and his wife.

I would also like to ask all members of the assembly to recognize in the Speaker's gallery today the second vice-president of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia, Andrejs Krastins. Please join me in welcoming our special guests.

STUDENT NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

Mr Hayes: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to bring a matter to the attention of this House. Earlier today I received a disturbing piece of correspondence. It

was a takeoff of the Globe and Mail drafted to mock the government.

As members of the government, we are prepared to listen to the opposition's questions and demands daily, as we should. However, I do not condone what would appear to be a sad attempt at humour by a member of the Liberal Party. The mock article went beyond poking fun at a few honourable members. No, it made a sexist reference to a female member of our cabinet. I will not read out the member's name, Mr Speaker, but I will give you some information.

The article referred to her as the minister in charge of state censorship and it portrayed her in a stereotypical light at a time when all members of the Legislature are trying to make progress with regard to sexism. It described her as using a red polka-dot handkerchief to wash "the puddles of tears running down her lightly tanned face." The mock story goes on to attribute fairly graphic quotes to the member. Out of respect for this House and the member, I will not recite those quotes.

I am not suggesting that the member for Mississauga West wrote this article and I will not accuse him of distributing it. I will say, though, that stapled to the article was a compliments card supplied to us by the Legislative Assembly. That being the case, I would, if the member for Mississauga West had any involvement in this tasteless prank—this is a sexist piece of work. Public funds have been misused as well. We may all have our philosophical differences, but I would like to believe we share a common respect for this House and its members. I would like to believe that a member of this House played no part in distributing such material.

The Speaker: I appreciate the matter raised by the member for Essex-Kent. I draw to his attention that it has been the practice in this chamber for some time that when there are concerns with respect to other members of the assembly, those concerns are brought to our attention when the member is present. However, the member is now here. I am not sure if he was privy to the information presented. If he was, he is entitled to respond.

Mr Mahoney: I just heard it on television. The article the gentleman is referring to is a copy of the University of Western Ontario newspaper. It was certainly not written by me. It was written by the University of Western Ontario and distributed. I have a son who goes there who sent me a copy and said, "You might think this is funny." I thought it was. I thought the member might. They are certainly not my remarks. It is written and edited by that university.

The Speaker: Point of order. Is this on the same matter?

Mr Sutherland: Yes, it is. If I could just clarify, Mr Speaker, this paper is not written by the University of Western Ontario; it is an April fool's edition put out by the student newspaper at the University of Western Ontario.

1350

The Speaker: Thank you for helping to clarify the matter. I do not believe it is a matter of privilege, but I certainly will be most pleased to take a look at it if the

member would be kind enough to send the document to the table.

Mr White: Mr Speaker, on that same matter, the member opposite stated very clearly where that article came from. However, he did not state how his card came to be attached to it and how it came to be circulated at the expense of our government.

The Speaker: The matter has been dealt with. In fact, members may realize this is something which happened outside of the House.

Hon Miss Martel: Mr Speaker, I would like to ask for unanimous consent of the House for statements with respect to the day of mourning.

Agreed to.

DAY OF MOURNING

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I rise today to announce to all members of the House that 28 April 1991 has been proclaimed the official day of mourning in this province. We urge that everyone in Ontario take a moment on that day to mourn the loss of workers who have died on the job or through occupational-related illness.

Today we all wear black armbands to recognize these senseless deaths. This observance is more than symbolic. Every year in this province there are hundreds killed and tens of thousands injured through the course of their working lives, and for years in this House and elsewhere, I have expressed my outrage and anger at the sacrifices made by Ontario workers.

In proclaiming 28 April the day of mourning, I want to make sure we recognize the contributions of these workers and honour their memory. I also want to ensure that the day of mourning serves as a spur to action, a catalyst to make sure that we continue to work towards improving workplace health and safety.

This government is committed to workplace health and safety. We are committed to ensuring that the workers who have died on the job, and there were 205 of them last year, did not die in vain, and that these fatality figures do not reflect the true toll taken by occupational disease, which is estimated to be as high as 6,000 Ontario workers each year—205 lives, 6,000 lives. We are all acutely aware that we are talking about more than numbers. We need to comfort their families, co-workers and friends and assure them that we will do everything in our power to prevent any further waste of life.

The Occupational Health and Safety Act now calls for equal participation from workers and employers to work together to improve health and safety. We are committed to this shared effort and are determined to make it work effectively. This should instil a sense of equality and common purpose between labour and management when it comes to health and safety.

It is really simple logic. Why should an employee not have a say over matters that can result in injury or death? Is there any job so important that a worker has to risk his or her life? Why do some companies not hesitate to halt production if products are defective, but balk at stopping production when workers' lives are in jeopardy? Who is

better equipped to know of the hazards of the shop floor than the workers who spend a good part of their waking hours on that shop floor? Have we reached a point in this province where products, deadlines and money are more important than the health and safety of people? For all our sakes, I hope not.

The black armbands I and all of my fellow members wear today are a signal that we intend to fight to ensure that workers are guaranteed the right to a safe and healthy environment; and to those who have lost family, friends and co-workers as a result of workplace accidents, these armbands are our way of saying that their loss is neither in vain nor forgotten.

Mr Offer: As the House will be aware, the federal government recently passed into law a bill proclaiming 28 April of each year as a day of mourning for persons killed or injured in the workplace. This worthy bill was supported by all parties in the House of Commons and the Senate. The date of 28 April was chosen by the Canadian Labour Congress five years ago to mark the date upon which the first workers' safety legislation was passed in Canada, and that was passed by the Ontario Legislature in the year 1914.

Ontario has a history of leading the way to protect its workers, but we must continue. We must continue to enhance the protection of workers in the workplace. Worker fatalities average a total of over 200 a year in Ontario. Even one work-related death is too many. Hundreds of thousands more workers are injured each year.

Efforts must be expanded in the area of worker and employer education. We must continue to fight to eliminate dangerous substances and chemicals-related injuries by ensuring that employers and workers are aware of safer, less dangerous alternatives and we must encourage them to use them. We can improve on our efforts to educate workers and employers about other potential hazards in the workplace by developing innovative methods of education which do not rely solely on the written word.

This is an important day. This is an important moment, a moment where we reflect on those who have lost their lives in the workplace and a moment where we reflect upon those who have been injured in the workplace, and we collectively commit ourselves to making certain that efforts continue and are enhanced in terms of safety in the workplace.

Mrs Witmer: I am proud to rise today, on behalf of my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative caucus, to join the members from the other two parties in expressing this House's genuine respect and concern for all the working men and women in this province and our recognition of the many workers who have lost their lives or have been seriously injured through workplace accidents or industrial diseases.

On Sunday 28 April, as has been mentioned, workers throughout this province will be joining together to honour their colleagues who have lost their lives or who were injured in the performance of their jobs. It will be a day of mourning and a time to remember. Only if we take the time to remember those men and women whose lives were

so tragically cut short through accidents and disease which occurred in the workplace can we ensure that as legislators we will remain dedicated to the task of reducing the risk of future deaths and injuries.

As we mourn the men and women who have died and been injured, each one of us should reflect on the work that has been done by our predecessors in the establishment of the workers' compensation system, the passage of the Occupational Health and Safety Act and the other measures which this Legislature has taken over the years in an attempt to minimize the risk of death or injury to workers. However, although much has been done, there is much, much more that must be done in the future.

Today, workers face a variety of job-related injuries that our predecessors would never have imagined. It is our task to provide as safe a workplace as possible. The workers' compensation system, which is over 75 years old, is in need of fundamental reform, and our occupational health and safety laws must be kept up to date and relevant to the changing nature of the workplace.

As we observe this day of mourning to remember and to honour those who have died or those who have been seriously injured and we remember their families, let us, in this House, together with management and with labour, renew our commitment to work together co-operatively to protect all the men and the women in this province from serious injury and death in the future.

The Speaker: I would invite all members and indeed our visitors today to stand and bow our heads in a moment of silence.

1400

The House observed one minute's silence.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Please be seated. Before continuing, I would like the members to welcome a former member who served in this Legislature for three decades, Harry Worton, the MPP for Wellington South, seated way up there in the public gallery.

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Hon Mr Philip: One of the most difficult duties as Minister of Transportation has been to meet with hardworking people who are losing their incomes, their homes and their means of earning a living. These people are representatives of Ontario trucking organizations, trucking companies and individual truckers who, through no fault of their own, are facing the destruction of their industry as a result of the combination of unwise federal and former provincial government policies and the recession.

Ontario truckers are angry and frustrated. They have been waiting far too long for government action, and I am now in a position to begin taking action to address their needs and concerns.

Our government is committed to rebuilding the trucking industry in Ontario. Many of the economic problems confronting the trucking industry stem from federal fiscal and monetary policies, policies which are not only beyond

our control but which hamper our ability to assist the trucking industry. Issues such as deregulation, high interest rates, fiscal policies, and enforcement of customs and immigration matters have all taken their toll on the industry. I will continue to bring our concerns to the attention of our federal counterpart.

During these past months, I have done my best to listen and respond to this troubled industry on issues which are within the jurisdiction of my ministry. Today, I am pleased to announce a package of initiatives aimed at stabilizing the Ontario trucking industry.

The trucking industry today simply has too many truckers for too little work. The situation is getting worse every day as more truckers enter the business. In response to this oversupply of services, effective immediately I am proposing a moratorium on the issuing of any new carrier licences to operate within Ontario. This moratorium will be in effect for up to two years or until the longer-term solutions are devised and implemented. This limitation of licences will help to curtail the decline of the industry and will provide my ministry with time and opportunity to address further measures which can be taken in future to promote the viability of the industry.

As well, we will register and require bonding for Ontario-based load brokers. Too often, truckers pay the price of failures and unfair business practices within the brokerage sector of the industry. Registering and bonding load brokers who make their living contracting freight shipments will help protect truckers from economic hardship.

It is crucial to remember that regardless of the assistance our government can provide, the Ontario trucking industry must be in a position to compete. A viable Ontario trucking industry has a vast economic impact for our province. It is an extremely important link in the manufacturing and service component of our economy.

We will continue to work with the trucking companies, with the owner-operators, with labour groups and users of trucking services to increase productivity through the improvement of business and management skills. We will extend this to include possible technological and legislative changes to enhance the ability of our truckers to haul freight more effectively.

We are responding to issues facing the industry. Provincial actions to date include increasing enforcement measures to ensure that US- and Ontario-based truckers comply equally with existing regulations. The Ontario government has implemented a fine of more than \$300 for violations of fuel tax laws and we have laid more than 2,000 charges since I became minister. We have placed increased emphasis on highway enforcement, with special attention to inspection stations, particularly those near border points. And we have completed 40 audits of American trucking companies since last summer to ensure that all carriers operating within Ontario comply with our regulations.

I recognize that these initiatives will not by themselves solve the dire problems facing the Ontario trucking industry. Among the most serious of industry problems are the transborder policies of deregulation and free trade which

make it almost impossible for Ontario truckers to compete fairly with their American counterparts.

The federal government simply must re-examine its policies as they affect the Ontario trucking industry. We recently experienced a very tangible manifestation of truckers' anger and frustration in border blockades. In failing to assist truckers, the federal government is in effect jeopardizing the Ontario-based trucking industry and the provincial economy.

In my ministry, we are in the midst of an intensive transborder competitiveness study which will give us a clearer indication of future directions. This government cannot shelter the trucking industry from the current economic turndown and we cannot protect the industry from federal actions, but we are taking significant steps. I call on my federal counterpart to do the same.

We can and we will work with the Ontario trucking industry and restore it as a strong, viable component of Ontario's economy.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT

Hon Mr Farnan: As minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy, I was pleased to launch a new service today that will bring immediate help to people who have problems and concerns about drug and alcohol abuse. Called the Drug Helpline, this new telephone distress service will contribute to our long-term goal of making Ontario a healthy, drug-free province.

The Drug Helpline is an innovative new service funded and co-ordinated by the provincial anti-drug secretariat. It has been done with a great deal of help from the distress centres in five Ontario communities. The helpline is accessible to all people in Ontario at all hours of the day and night, seven days a week.

It is important to note that the Drug Helpline is staffed by experienced and dedicated volunteers, people who have extensive training. Volunteers also learn where they can refer callers wanting to know about local treatment and referral services, all of which have been co-ordinated by the anti-drug secretariat.

The Drug Helpline will provide many different kinds of services to Ontario residents concerned either about their own problems with substance abuse or about problems friends or family members may be having. Callers to the Drug Helpline can receive basic information about drugs and alcohol and their abuse. They will also be able to receive sympathetic and supportive telephone counseling. If the caller's need is urgent, the Drug Helpline can initiate crisis intervention. The trained volunteers can also refer callers to appropriate local community resources.

Thanks to the new telephone technology developed by Bell Canada, it is possible to call one telephone number, 1-800-567-DRUG, to reach the Drug Helpline throughout most of Ontario. The new smart-switch technology enables all callers to be linked immediately to a distress centre in their own region. This allows the Drug Helpline to respond to local issues and to identify the right community resources for the caller. Metro Toronto region callers can dial 486-DRUG and be connected to volunteers at the Metro Toronto Distress Centre.

1410

Funding for the Toronto Drug Helpline is being shared in a unique partnership among three levels of government, including the city of Toronto, the city of North York, Metro Toronto and the province.

I believe this new telephone helpline is an extremely important addition to our ongoing efforts to reduce the impact of drug and alcohol abuse in our society. For example, a worried mother in North Bay, with a call to a single province-wide 800 number, can get essential information about the drugs she thinks her child may be taking. She will learn about what symptoms to look for and what effects the drugs may have on her child. Or a young girl in Ottawa, worried about her father's drinking, can call that same 800 number and be connected to a kind, carefully trained volunteer in her own area. Both callers can also learn where to find help in their own communities.

The Drug Helpline is a two-year pilot project. It will be carefully evaluated to ensure that the goals we have set are indeed met. We want to make sure that the Drug Helpline is an invaluable service in our continuing efforts to deal with drug and alcohol abuse.

The impetus for a province-wide Drug Helpline originated as a result of basic grass-roots requests from communities throughout Ontario. Mayors' task forces in several communities, including Toronto, Ottawa and London, identified the urgent need for a readily accessible, 24-hour-a-day source of information and assistance to all residents of their communities. One phone call to a distress centre can change or even save a person's life, and a substantial percentage of calls to Ontario distress centres are already related to drug and alcohol abuse.

I am delighted to be able to inform all members that this important service is now operating. I hope all members encourage residents in their communities to use this valuable service.

RESPONSES

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Mancini: I wish to respond to the feeble statement made today by the Minister of Transportation.

Mr Speaker, I want to remind you, sir, because I know you will recall, that during the administration of the last government, 2,000 permits were provided so that Ontario truckers could have longer trailers. Under the Liberal administration those permits were given exclusively to Ontario truckers. When the NDP took over there were approximately 700 permits left, and they gave them exclusively to American truckers. That competitive edge was given exclusively to our American competitors.

I want to remind the minister, who makes a statement today, one day after—and the Minister of Health shakes her head. It is true, I say to her. She and her cabinet gave those permits to American truckers. They took away the advantage that we tried to give to Ontario truckers. That is a fact.

I want to remind the House that a number of important initiatives were put on the table by the Ontario trucking industry. The government of Ontario and the Ontario Trucking Association formed an adjustment strategy

committee, it reported to the minister prior to his taking office. He has had seven months to look at their report.

This is what they have asked him to do: They have asked him for the reintroduction of temporary exemption from provincial sales tax on heavy trucks and trailers. They have asked the minister for a temporary one-cent-per-litre reduction in the provincial diesel fuel tax. They have asked the minister to establish an interest rate assistance program for the trucking industry similar to what Ontario farmers receive. They have asked the minister to establish Ontario current cost adjustment tax incentive programs for the trucking industry similar to the ones which the Ontario manufacturing sector receives. They have also asked the minister to become more proactive in analysing and challenging US state taxes with respect to impact on international trade. They have asked the minister for a wide variety of things that all fall under provincial jurisdiction.

We ask the minister to respond to the report that he has had in his hands for well over seven months and meet the needs of our industry.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT

Mr Beer: The announcement by the minister today on the establishment of the Drug Helpline is certainly something that is useful to have, but what we have been waiting for is to hear what the minister is going to be doing about some of the basic programs that we need.

My colleague the member for Scarborough-Agincourt called our attention last fall to the need for treatment facilities. We know that some \$50 million, and the amount is growing, is being spent in the United States for drug and alcohol programs. What is the use of having a phone when you phone and the answer is going to lead you, in all probability, to have to seek treatment in the United States?

What we were expecting and what we want to see, what indeed the former Minister of Health in the last government had said, is that treatment facilities would be opened in Cornwall and in Elliot Lake, but we have heard no announcement about that. We have seen no signs that in fact these facilities will be available.

We all recognize that enforcement, treatment and education are all part of the anti-drug strategy. But increasingly those who are expert in the field are saying that what Ontario must do is turn its attention to ensuring that we have facilities here in this province where we can send those who need drug and alcohol treatment. Are we going to see it in the budget? The Treasurer may tell us that on Monday, but so far we have seen no action and indeed, just a number of words saying, "Yes, we are going to move in this regard."

What I would like to say to the minister is, we understand there is a review right now of the activities of the anti-drug secretariat and there has been comment and speculation as to whether it would be better to place that secretariat within the Ministry of Health so that we could co-ordinate more effectively this combination of programs.

We would like to know, and again various community groups and others have asked us, is there going to be participation from those who are involved in this broad area, in talking about what the future should be in terms of these

programs and where the focus for the co-ordination of all of our programs against drugs and alcohol should be focused? This is but one step, and I would remind the minister and indeed the cabinet that what we need is movement on Monday with respect to treatment.

TRUCKING INDUSTRY

Mr Arnott: In my capacity as Transportation critic for the Progressive Conservative Party I have taken a particular interest in the trucking issues that we have been facing and I am perplexed, somewhat frankly, because last Monday, when I requested of the minister what he was prepared to do with respect to the trucking problems, he indicated basically that there was nothing he could do or there was nothing more that he could do. It was entirely the federal government that was at fault.

In my own consultation with trucking groups, carriers and individuals in my own riding it became apparent to me that there was more that he could do. Certainly the minister was aware that there was more that he could do as early as two months ago when I wrote a letter to him asking for some specific, constructive suggestions as to what he could be doing to help the trucking industry, but I did not get a response. The minister has been having some difficulty responding to letters. Certainly the copy that he received from the Solicitor General's office he has not responded to as yet either.

I have a couple of questions with respect to the specifics of the announcement. I wonder, will this moratorium on new carrier licences apply to people who have already applied or to applications that are presently in the minister's office? Will there be a review within the next couple of years as to whether or not the moratorium needs to continue over the two-year period that he has initially given the moratorium period for?

The transfer of licences: If an individual company wishes to leave the business, is it allowed to sell the licence? Will there become a market in those licences? That raises some measure of concern, I think.

1420

I am also concerned about the aspect of the bonding for Ontario-based load brokers and I wonder whether or not that may in fact reduce the competitiveness of our shippers and our manufacturers if it will increase the cost of transportation. I am concerned about that.

The minister also indicates that he will take "further efforts to allow the ability of our truckers to haul freight more efficiently." I hope he will review his initial position as stated on the longer trucks issue, because there have been studies and studies that have been demonstrated to me that the 25-metre tandem trucks are in fact quite safe. I hope that he will review that again.

There are more things that the minister could do and he knows it, and specific things that the Ontario PC government in the 1981-82 recession, did to help the trucking industry. Number one was cutting the diesel fuel tax; number two, providing a full rebate on the retail sales tax for the purchase of new trucks and big equipment.

Those are the things that our government did, and I think that the minister could review this. I hope he will

raise it with the Treasurer to include some of those measures in his budget, because we do need tax cuts. If the minister wants to get talking about competitiveness, he has got to start looking at tax cuts.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG TREATMENT

Mr Carr: I would just like to add a little bit to the discussion on the drug hotline. While I think it is a good first step, I wish the minister had taken this particular ministry as more of a higher priority.

We read reports where as high as 31% of the blue-collar workers at General Motors are afflicted and are seriously impaired, and 20% of the white-collar workers. Statistics that are in the paper are dramatic, and we need to make sure that something is done in that area. It is literally costing us billions of dollars in lost productivity on top of the human tragedy that is out there. I see this as a step, but unfortunately we are not making much of a dent in the problem.

I have seen and had firsthand experience while I went out with the undercover agents in the Halton area and saw while drug deals were being made. In fact, I spent some time up in the Premier's own riding in the Jane-Finch area and watched while drugs were being dealt. That will not help the situation. We need to address that in terms of enforcement.

I also spent some time with regard to treatment at the Donwood Institute. They tell me there that for a cost of \$6,000 they can have a very, very high success ratio at treating drug and alcohol and prescription drug people. Instead of \$6,000 we are spending \$439,000 to treat one individual when in fact at the Donwood in our own area they say the success ratio would be very high and we could treat probably about 70 more people.

When the hotline numbers come in, what we have got to do is make sure there are more fine facilities like the Donwood. I would encourage the minister to take some time to go up there and speak to the director who had some creative ideas, to spend the time on the front lines with drugs, our men and our women, the two officers who put together this report on how to deal with the drug strategy.

There is a lot that needs to be done, and unfortunately we are just scratching the surface. I would like to be able to participate and help with some of the thoughts on that and will be working very, very quickly to do that.

VISITOR

Mrs Caplan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: In my capacity as critic for Municipal Affairs I would like to inform the Speaker and the House that the regional chairman of Peel, Frank Bean, is in the members' gallery today.

I know that there is no formal way that the Speaker can introduce him as the tradition is that he introduce parliamentarians. However, I would want to bring to the Speaker's attention that Mr Bean is here and I know that all members of this House would want to be aware of that fact. I believe it is a very important point of order at this time.

The Speaker: The member may know that it is not a point of order but I do appreciate her drawing that matter to my attention.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: I have a question of the Solicitor General. He stated yesterday and he has repeated previously that in reference to the unfortunate letter directed to the justice of the peace asking the justice of the peace to review a matter before the courts and to report to the Solicitor General, he himself has done nothing wrong and his conscience is clear.

I would call the Solicitor General's attention and the attention of the members of the House to certain facts which have been given the House by the minister and others and which are certainly not in dispute.

One fact is that he knew nothing of the letter and did not sign it and did not know that it was sent. That is accepted and is not in question.

Second, the Solicitor General has admitted that he authorized his staff to sign routine correspondence on his behalf. I have already commented on the unusual aspect of that permission.

Further, he himself has stated that letters with his name attached in similar fashion were sent out by his office on at least one other occasion. He has not released this letter to the members of the House or publicly, as far as is known. He has also told the House that these letters were approved and authorized by senior staff members.

My question to the Solicitor General is as follows: Can he comment on those facts and accept that they have been put before the House by himself, by the Premier or by some other of his colleagues? Can he indicate how many of these letters have been sent out by his staff, and will he table specifically the letter he referred to in his own answer?

Hon Mr Farnan: There are so many questions here but I will attempt to reiterate the position. The Leader of the Opposition is quite correct. I did not know about the letter. I did not sign the letters. I did not give approval for the letters, and there are indeed some incidents around certain letters.

Now what I did do was this. I handed over what correspondence came to light to the Attorney General. I also indicated that all of the correspondence, all of the documentation, everything in my office was available to the investigation so that they could investigate the incidents. I have met with the investigating officers of the RCMP. I was offered the opportunity of having legal counsel, which I declined, basically because I want to be as open and as frank as possible about this issue. I have nothing to hide. All of the evidence is with the investigating team, and that is where the matter stands at this time.

Mr Nixon: I understand the Attorney General has advised the Solicitor General's employees to retain legal counsel. Perhaps the Solicitor General has not asked the Attorney General for advice. But the Attorney General stated that he had asked the RCMP to investigate for

obvious reasons, because the OPP are under the direct supervision of the Solicitor General and anybody can see a certain conflict that would arise except for the presence of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The Attorney General has asked the RCMP to investigate the incident because, as he said yesterday, he felt he would otherwise be pilloried for not having ordered an investigation, probably the weakest excuse for inaction by an Attorney General that has ever been put forward in the annals of this House.

The Attorney General has also stated that the material he reviewed with senior legal advisers, independent of any of his political colleagues, was of sufficient complexity to require a police investigation into these matters. The Attorney General clearly believed that there were enough facts surrounding the incident to require a police investigation into the activities of the Solicitor General's office.

Can the Solicitor General indicate why the Premier in his answers has repeatedly said, "This is a simple matter," and the Attorney General in ordering in the RCMP has indicated there is sufficient complexity? Since the minister must know about the simplicity and the complexity, can he justify the decision taken by his colleagues in this regard?

Hon Mr Farnan: It has always been taken by me to be a serious matter. Now the fact of the matter is, an investigation is under way. We all have a responsibility, all of us have a responsibility, within the justice system to co-operate with an investigation. I believe that what my responsibility is right now—and I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that I have not been charged, I have not been responsible for any action that I knew about, that I approved or I participated in—is to co-operate and I want that co-operation to be absolute and total.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, you would understand, as do all members of this House, that complete co-operation of course would be forthcoming and anything less than that would be unthinkable. The thing that must concern us is that this series of events, which means that the minister is not responsible for his employees or the emanations from his office, may very well be used as a precedent, because it has not happened before, by other parliaments and legislatures across Canada and elsewhere around the world. There are no incidents where a minister responsible for interfering with the independent course of justice has simply renounced that responsibility and said that it lies with someone else.

1430

I want to say that this issue has nothing to do with parking tickets. It has nothing to do with poorly recruited or instructed staff or even with a vindictive opposition. It does not even have anything to do with the problems that the head of the government has been experiencing in recent weeks and may continue to experience in the future. The situation, however, has everything to do with ministerial responsibility and the real or perceived interference by a cabinet minister—in this case, the chief law enforcement officer in the province—with the course of justice and with the responsibility of the minister for his staff and their activities.

The only question I can put to the minister is: Does the minister himself not realize the gravity of his situation, the fact that his renouncing of responsibilities sets a precedent not only for this jurisdiction but elsewhere? Then he must surely, on a personal basis, accept that responsibility and step aside until the Royal Canadian Mounted Police investigation is completed or, more properly, resign his office.

Hon Mr Farnan: I did not know about these letters. I did not sign these letters. I did not approve or give anyone an authority to sign these letters. I am again going to say to the Leader of the Opposition my conscience is clear. I did nothing wrong. However, I do accept the seriousness of what has transpired and I want to ensure and guarantee that such can never happen again.

Mr Scott: I would like to get the reaction of the Solicitor General to a matter that was raised in this connection yesterday. The Solicitor General's office staff have written at least two letters, as he has conceded, in which they have invited a justice of the court to review a conviction already undertaken, clearly with a view to having it set aside, and asked for notification if that will not occur.

The Solicitor General has said that he did not know anything about that, although he did authorize these two people to sign routine correspondence. The matter is one of complexity, as the Attorney General has said, and raises important issues to which my leader has referred. An RCMP investigation is now under way and the Solicitor General has told us that he has already been interrogated by the police. The Solicitor General is the direct employer of thousands of police officers in the province of Ontario. Indirectly, as Solicitor General, he is the employer of thousands of others.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Scott: Does the Solicitor General not understand that, as a matter of convention and law, every police officer who is the subject of a criminal investigation is obliged to step down? How does the Solicitor General explain to the police officers under his direct employment that there is going to be from now on a different role for him? He can stay in office, they cannot. They all may be innocent, he may be innocent, but why is he different from the people who serve with him?

Hon Mr Farnan: I want to make it very clear that I was interviewed by officers of the RCMP. I was not interrogated. I was there to provide as much information as possible. I want to make it very clear that if you are interviewed by any police force as part of an investigation, that in no way suggests in our justice system that indeed you are the subject of the investigation. As a former Attorney General, I would have expected that the member would know that.

Mr Scott: I do not think a former Attorney General or indeed even the present Attorney General would for a moment hesitate to submit his resignation to his Premier in the light of these circumstances. I want to refer the Solicitor General to an article which appeared today in the Toronto Sun.

Interjections.

Mr Scott: You have to get your news where you can. The Solicitor General and his colleagues may make light of this, but it is important because it concerns a police officer in the town of Milton who tried to help a friend with a \$40 speeding ticket. There is an investigation under way and that police officer, like every other one in the province, is obliged to take a suspension with pay until the investigation is complete. He may be totally innocent, but to preserve the integrity of the system he is required by the Solicitor General to step down pending the investigation, the interrogation or the meeting, as the minister has it.

What I want to ask the Solicitor General to explain to that police officer and his brothers and sisters across the province is why he thinks he should be dealt with differently. He should tell that police officer in Milton how he explains this.

Hon Mr Farnan: Yesterday the former Attorney General made an allegation in this House. He then withdrew that allegation in this House. The substance of the allegation was this: He stated that I actually was responsible. He withdrew it in this House. Clearly I am not the subject of an investigation and I would hope that a former Attorney General knowledgeable in the law as he is would understand that I have not been charged, that I am not a subject in this case, that the subject in this case is the investigation of the incidents in question.

Mr Scott: The whole burden of the argument that the opposition has been making for three days is that because the Solicitor General is a minister of the crown he has ministerial responsibility for what happens in his office even if, as we accept, he may not personally have signed the letter but simply authorized somebody in routine correspondence to use his name. That is the point we are making that has led to a criminal investigation by the RCMP.

I want the minister to speak directly not only to the police officers that he supervises in Ontario but to that police officer in Milton who tried to help a friend with a \$40 speeding ticket and who is now by his mandate suspended with pay even though he may be completely innocent. I want the minister to explain to him why the minister gets the benefit of a different rule than he does.

Hon Mr Farnan: As a former Attorney General the member would stand in this House and attempt to lure me into making comment on another case, and I say to him I refuse to do that. This is the incident in question. While I admire his style, I will not fall for that kind of cheap politics.

Mr Eves: I also have a question of the Solicitor General. Yesterday my leader asked him in a very straightforward manner a question which I will read for the record: "Did he instruct his staff, he personally, he as Solicitor General, verbally, directly?" That was the question. The minister's answer was also very straightforward: "The answer is yes."

Can the Solicitor General tell us today how it is that not one, not two but three members of his staff wrote not one but two letters that we know of to two different justices of the peace? How could that happen?

1440

Hon Mr Farnan: That is precisely why we are having an investigation. We have incidents that we recognize are serious. All of the documentation and correspondence were handed over to the Attorney General. An investigation has been called. I have indicated absolute openness, I have indicated absolute co-operation, and I am prepared to live by the results of that investigation. It is very, very simple.

Mr Eves: It is so simple that the Solicitor General cannot tell us how it came to pass. That is how simple it is.

My supplementary to the Solicitor General is again very direct. Did he inquire of his staff how this came about—they are his staff—and did he inquire whether there had been any other instances than these two that he has informed the House about?

Hon Mr Farnan: I made it a particular purpose and point on my part that I would not speak with any member of that staff who is involved in the incidents surrounding this situation while the investigation was under way, and I will continue to do that at this time.

The Speaker: Final supplementary.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Parry Sound has the floor.

Mr Eves: To the Solicitor General—

Interjection.

The Speaker: I am sure the member for Parry Sound would like us to get back on track.

Interjection.

The Speaker: Would the member for Wilson Heights—

Mr Kwinter: You've got to get yourself a new writer.

The Speaker: New writer or not, I am sure the member for Wilson Heights is now ready to hear the question from the member for Parry Sound. Right? Good.

Mr Perruzza: Come on, Ernie. Have you got something new?

Mr Eves: I do not think we need anything new. We have more than we need.

The member for Cambridge became the Solicitor General of this province on 1 October. On 12 December, the Premier issued his guidelines. The Solicitor General has stated in this House in the past couple of days that his constituency office staff did not receive a copy of the guidelines until 4 March.

Any knowledgeable individual would know the day that he was sworn in on 1 October that he should convey this sort of information to his staff about keeping at arm's length from the judicial system. Can he explain why it took a Solicitor General of this province six months to talk to his staff before they got a copy of these guidelines and almost three months after the Premier issued the guidelines?

Hon Mr Farnan: There are specific conflict guidelines for constituency offices that were developed at the end of February and that were received in my office on

1 March. They are specific for that particular group. That is why the staff received them so promptly after they were issued.

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Attorney General. Yesterday, the Premier said that the Solicitor General need not resign because there are no allegations against him. We have two letters. They were sent to justices of the peace to fix traffic tickets. They were sent from the Solicitor General's office. They had the Solicitor General's name on them. They seemed to breach two of the Premier's guidelines for conflict of interest.

The Attorney General has taken it upon himself, he says, to call for an RCMP investigation. I would like him to tell me please, will he not admit that allegations exist? I am not asking him to admit the validity of allegations. All I want him to do is come clean and tell this Legislature that allegations do exist.

Hon Mr Hampton: I would think it would be most improper for me at this point, since a police investigation is under way, to refer or indicate that allegations have been made against anyone at this time.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Hampton: I was very clear yesterday. I indicated that certain facts had come to the attention of senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General. Those facts were analysed. A decision was reached that based upon those facts it would be proper to ask the RCMP to conduct an investigation surrounding those facts and into those incidents. That is what has happened. When the investigation is complete, we will have more to say.

Mr Harnick: Yesterday the Premier said that the Solicitor General is not part of an RCMP investigation. Will the Attorney General confirm what kind of criminal investigation is going on, whether it involves the conduct of the Solicitor General or whether that criminal investigation is confined to the conduct of his staff?

Hon Mr Hampton: I answered this question yesterday as well.

Mr Harnick: No, he did not.

Hon Mr Hampton: The police are conducting an investigation—

Mr Harnick: Into what?

Hon Mr Hampton: —into the incidents surrounding two letters which were sent from the constituency office.

Mr Harnick: Yesterday he said he spoke with no one outside of his senior legal advisers before calling in the RCMP. He said he did not speak with the Premier's office about this matter. Why is the Premier quoted as stating unequivocally that the investigation only concerns letters and not the Solicitor General's involvement?

Hon Mr Hampton: Yesterday, after senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General had contacted the RCMP, had sat down and presented the facts that they knew about to the RCMP and advised the RCMP, the Ministry of the Attorney General released a press release. I am sorry if it did not come to the attention of the honourable member, but I am aware it came to the attention of the press gallery and many other members in the Legislature.

That press release stated that the investigation was into the incidents in question. It did not identify anybody. It simply said the incidents were being investigated. I should say this: The RCMP will take the information it receives and it will investigate it. I do not control who they investigate. I do not control who they interview. They will follow the information they have.

Mr Offer: I have a question of the Solicitor General. He and the Premier have been quite specific as to how the letter from his office was sent to a justice of the peace. I want to try to present this as clearly as possible. Under the office procedures which he instituted, he has told us that he established for his office and for his staff an authorization to handle routine correspondence in his name, under his name and able to sign his name. All other correspondence that would come to his attention would be signed and authorized by him. These are his rules he has indicated to this House, that there was an authorization which he gave to his staff to be able to sign letters on his behalf. He has already stated that he has given his staff that authorization.

1450

The Speaker: Are we at the interrogative part?

Mr Offer: Yes, I am.

The Speaker: Good.

Mr Offer: I am just moving into that. Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Solicitor General says that he did not give authorization for this letter, but the fact is that he has given an authorization for his staff. Having delegated such authorization, he must be responsible for its ramifications.

Interjections.

Mr Offer: It is quite interesting how the other side finds this to be somewhat jocular, but the fact of the matter is—my question to the Solicitor General—does he accept any responsibility for the actions of his staff or are the letters which he has authorized totally useless?

Hon Mr Farnan: I am sorry, but with the din, I could not hear the question that was there. Could I ask that it be repeated.

The Speaker: Briefly, would you pose just the question.

Mr Offer: Very briefly, the Solicitor General gave his staff authorization in certain circumstances to sign letters. My question is, this is not an issue where there has been no authorization ever given by him. He did give an authorization.

The Speaker: The question, please.

Mr Offer: My question to the Solicitor General is, does he accept responsibility for that authorization which he has in fact given to his staff?

Hon Mr Farnan: I thank the member for his patience in repeating the question. I appreciate it.

I want to make it very clear that both in writing, through the conflict guidelines, and verbally through myself, I have consistently repeated the principle by which I work. The principle that I hope I am the example of and that I want my staff to emulate is that there is arm's-length distance between my office and any member of

the judiciary. Of course there can be no authorization for contact with a justice of the peace.

Mr Offer: I am profoundly disappointed by that type of response, but this is not an isolated incident. We know it is public information that the staffer in question was authorized by a senior staffer to send out the letter and that another staffer was involved in sending out at least one other letter which is under investigation.

The reason the Solicitor General is under investigation is specifically because this was not an isolated mistake. It was confirmed yesterday in this House by his colleague the Attorney General, who had stated, "Just on the material I have received and I have reviewed, there is some complexity to the matter." We have at least three staff and two direct interventions with the administration of justice and an investigation by the RCMP. There is, at very best, a perception that the legislative wing of government has touched the judiciary. There is an investigation going on. I ask the Solicitor General, even on the basis of this perception of the touching of the legislative side with the judicial side, should he not step aside until such investigation has been completed?

Hon Mr Farnan: I recognize my colleague in the House as an honourable man and I know that he was off base when he said that I am being investigated. I take that for granted, because he is an honourable man.

The point of the fact is and I have to reiterate this again and again, that I did not know about the letters; I did not give authorization for the letters to be sent; I did not give authorization for my signature to be attached to a letter going to a justice of the peace. In fact, I am not the subject of the investigation; the incidents are the subject of the investigation. That very fact that there is an investigation is very clear that I hold this a very serious matter. So does the government. The investigation is taking place.

Mr Sterling: I would like to ask the Solicitor General a question. When did he first instruct his staff not to contact the judiciary of this province?

Hon Mr Farnan: The first thing that happened to me when I was sworn in was that I walked over to the office of the Solicitor General where I was met by my deputy. The very first briefing session, I think, lasted a couple of hours when we were getting to know each other and he stressed and impressed upon me that there must be an arm's-length distance between the Solicitor General and any of the judiciary.

In fact, he showed me on the wall the portraits of solicitor generals who had infringed upon that arm's-length distance. In fact, it was ingrained in my consciousness that a Solicitor General cannot be in any way associated with the judiciary. I have from the very beginning transmitted that message to everybody I come into contact with.

Mr Sterling: We have two letters signed with his name at the bottom of them. He claims that he is not responsible. Who is responsible for this incursion to the justice of the peace?

Hon Mr Farnan: I do not know how long it takes to get this through, but I will repeat it again. I do not claim not to have written the letters; I did not write the letters. I

did not give approval. I did not authorize. It is not a matter of claiming. These are facts. Of course, it is serious. Of course, this is a serious matter and that is why we have an RCMP investigation. Period.

NATIVE ISSUES

Mr Drainville: I would like to ask a question of the minister responsible for native affairs.

Interjections.

The Speaker: I was hoping to be able to hear the question from the member for Victoria-Haliburton. Please.

Mr Drainville: On Tuesday of this week, the Prime Minister of Canada indicated that he was going to start an initiative which would deal with aboriginal concerns. Part of that initiative had to do with the establishment of a royal commission on the needs of aboriginal people with regard to their culture, social issues and also economic issues. We know that this has raised a certain amount of controversy among aboriginal groups, and I am wondering if the minister could explain to the House whether this initiative on behalf of the federal government is going to have an impact on our agenda here in Ontario.

Hon Mr Wildman: I want to remind members of the House, in thanking the member for Victoria-Haliburton for his question, of the unanimous report of the select committee of this House which emphasized the need for this government to proceed with resolving aboriginal issues and to proceed on the agenda of constitutional matters affecting aboriginal people.

This government has made clear that it is a top priority to negotiate and address the issues of self-government and land claims. We would prefer the federal government to be involved, but if not, we are prepared to proceed on a bilateral basis. I believe that the time is for action, not for further study. Aboriginal people have been studied for too long. If the royal commission leads to the possibility of involving aboriginal people in the next round of constitutional talks, then I suppose it will have been worth while.

1500

Mr Drainville: As the minister knows, there was a part of this initiative announced by the Prime Minister which indicated that at the next round of constitutional talks there would be a chair for aboriginal people. I was wondering, first, does the minister know more about what the intention of the federal government is as regards that chair and, second, if he could expand on the view of the government or the policy of the government as regards involvement of aboriginal people at future constitutional debates?

Hon Mr Wildman: I think we will have to wait and see what the federal government's position is, but as for this government's position, we believe it is a minimum that aboriginal people be at the table and directly involved in the constitutional discussions. I think it is imperative that the aboriginal leadership of this country and the governments of the provinces and the federal government initiate discussions immediately as to how aboriginal people can be directly involved in the next round of constitutional talks. The Prime Minister's statements have been a little

equivocal in this regard, and I hope that he is determined, as we are, that aboriginal people will be directly involved in this round of constitutional talks in Canada.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr McGuinty: My question is also for the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General has indicated he did not sign the two letters discovered to date, and we have no reason not to accept that. He has said that his staff members had signed these letters and, further, that he gave a general authority to them to sign some kinds of letters.

We are not clear as to how this authority was circumscribed. The Solicitor General has said he authorized the signing of routine correspondence. We do not know the Solicitor General's definition of routine correspondence. More important, we do not know what the staff members' understanding of routine correspondence was at the time the letters were sent.

The Solicitor General indicated in his statement made in this House that the first letter was written by a probationary staff member who, in the words of the Solicitor General, "sought direction from a more experienced staff member." He also said the second letter was written by yet another constituency staff member. We now have three people, acting in two separate incidents, who for some reason felt they had authority to send out these letters.

If the Solicitor General contends that his constituency staff did not have authority to send these letters, why is it that three constituency staff members felt they had this authority, or is he alleging that they deliberately disobeyed his explicit instructions regarding letters to judges? And when and where specifically did he give these instructions?

Hon Mr Farnan: I explained yesterday that there is a distinction made by my staff of correspondence that would be brought to my attention. When I go back, and there is a distinction made, I sign letters that are brought to my attention. Decisions were made and we believe that there were errors that are serious in their implication. However, that is precisely why we are having an investigation, that is precisely why the RCMP is examining all of the issues surrounding this, precisely those issues that have been delineated by the member in his question.

Mr McGuinty: I am concerned that the Solicitor General, in an effort to distance himself from this matter, is perhaps inadvertently losing sight of the rights owed to those people who, according to our system of law, must be presumed innocent—his employees. On CBC radio this morning, the Attorney General said that the two employees who had signed a letter should, in light of the RCMP investigation, consider retaining legal counsel. The logical inference is that these two employees in question are under investigation and may have criminal charges laid against them.

Does the Solicitor General think it fair that these two employees, acting independently of one another, unless he is alleging somehow that they conspired together, acting with a legitimate—

Hon Mr Farnan: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I cannot hear the member's question.

Mr Harnick: Put your earphones on.

The Speaker: The chamber actually was quite quiet, an unusual occurrence. I think that the earphones might be of some help, and if the member could place his supplementary.

Mr McGuinty: My question for the Solicitor General is the following: Does he think it fair that these two employees, acting independently of one another, unless of course he is alleging that they conspired somehow, acting with a legitimate understanding that they had authority to send these letters, acting as agents of his on his behalf, should now become the subject of a criminal investigation and does he intend to provide them with independent legal counsel to ensure that their civil rights are protected? Furthermore, did he advise them of their rights to counsel when he asked questions of them regarding this incident?

Hon Mr Farnan: A very broad-ranging question, but let me try to take it piece by piece. Basically, the reality of the matter is that it is available to my staff in my constituency office to have counsel. Did I speak to them about that? I did not. I have already explained to the House that in this particular matter I have refrained from making contact with those members of staff because there is an investigation going on. I want to make it very clear that I have no intention of touching any letters, any documents, any information that is at my office, or of even talking to my staff, in order to give the investigative team the opportunity to talk to them. I think that is very clear.

It is my understanding it is not my staff who are being investigated, it is the incidents that are being investigated. I await the outcome of the report.

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General indicates that he is not under investigation, his staff are not under investigation, it is the incident that is under investigation. The incident involves the Solicitor General's name appearing in a letter asking for intervention, for a charge to be overturned, to a justice of the peace. His name is part of the incident. As well, we now know that his staff signed his name.

Is he telling us that this incident does not involve him as Solicitor General, with his name on it, and it does not involve his staff who signed the letter? Given the fact that we know that the Attorney General, who has called in the RCMP to investigate the incident, has suggested that the Solicitor General retain counsel, that his staff retain counsel—he did not suggest that the incident retain counsel; he suggested that the Solicitor General and his staff retain counsel—would he not assume from that that he and his staff are part of this investigation and he ought to step aside while this investigation is going on?

Hon Mr Farnan: The record will show that after three days the leader of the third party got it right. I am not under investigation, my staff are not under investigation, these incidents are under investigation. That is correct. The incidents are serious. Professional, experienced RCMP officers will review all the facts and they will decide what appropriate action must be taken.

Mr Harris: If what the Solicitor General is waiting for is an allegation, I will make the allegation in this House

that he is under investigation for giving a blanket permission to his staff and not explaining to them specifically that they should not sign his name to letters to justices of the peace. I make that allegation and I make it here in the House, as does, I think, everybody else who has heard anything of this case.

I as well make the allegation that his staff are under investigation as to why they signed his name, whether they understood his directions clearly, whether in fact he emphasized that directly or he talked about some arm's length which obviously they did not understand. Clearly, in my view, that is the substance of what is being investigated. I am comfortable to say that in the House; I will say that outside of the House.

1510

Given that these are the allegations that are being made, not just by me but by the Attorney General, who called in the RCMP—

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Harris: —who suggested that he get counsel, who suggested that his staff get counsel, would the Solicitor General not—

Hon Mr Hampton: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker—

Interjections.

The Speaker: One at a time. We were doing so well. Is this a point of order which could wait until later?

Hon Mr Hampton: I take offence when a member of the Legislature says things which I did not say and tries to put words into my mouth surrounding an investigation that is being conducted by the RCMP. That is most improper and it shows great disrespect for the legal process that we should respect in this country.

The Speaker: It is not a point of privilege. Had the leader of the third party completed his question?

Mr Harris: While the allegations surrounding the Solicitor General's involvement and his staff's involvement in this are being investigated by the RCMP, and he has been advised to obtain counsel while this investigation is going on, does he not agree it would be appropriate that he do what all police officers have to do, what everybody else involved in the justice system has to do while an investigation of this type is going on. Does he not agree that he should tender his resignation, or at least step aside while this investigation is ongoing?

Hon Mr Farnan: I do not agree.

NORTHERN BANKING SERVICES

Mr Wood: I have a question for the Minister of Revenue. A number of communities in Cochrane North do not have any banking facilities. Many members of Peawanuck, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany and Kashechewan have to travel hundreds of kilometres to centres like Timmins and Moosonee to do their banking. Those who cannot make this trip must rely on local retail stores to write cheques and pay bills on accounts drawn on their behalf.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat? The member for Etobicoke West, I am sure, might be interested in the question that the member is trying to place. I would like to hear it. The member for Cochrane North.

Mr Wood: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

As I had started off, residents of some of the communities in my riding of Cochrane North, and I named them—Peawanuck, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany and Kashechewan—have to travel hundreds of miles because there are no banking facilities in their communities. Those who cannot make the trip to Timmins or Moosonee must rely on local retail stores to write cheques and pay bills.

My question to the Minister of Revenue is: What banking services could this government provide to such remote communities?

Hon Ms Wark-Martyn: As a northerner, I am fully aware that people living in many northern communities go without essential services which people in urban areas take for granted. One of these services is banking facilities. For years, while in opposition, former NDP MPPs such as Jack Stokes, Elie Martel and Jim Foulds called for the extension of banking to these communities.

At present offices of the Province of Ontario Savings Office have been opened in five communities in the north: Pickle Lake, Virginiatown, Armstrong, Killarney and Gogama. I am proud to say that this government hopes to deal with this problem by establishing new savings offices.

The Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr Wood: She has covered my answer. I have no supplementary question.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Callahan: My question is to the Solicitor General. Interjections.

Mr Callahan: It seems to be a matter of great levity with the backbenchers.

I have sat here over the past many days on a matter of great distress, because I have served on committees with the minister over a lengthy period of time. He just does not seem to realize, I suggest, nor does the Premier of this province realize, that he is dealing in an area that is very sensitive. It is the question of justice in this province. It is not one such as perhaps befell the Minister of Health. It is not one that befell the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. It is a matter of justice.

What does the minister think went through the mind of the justice of the peace who received that letter when he got it? Does the minister think that sends a message to other justices of the peace in this community that before they act on instructions from a minister, particularly that of the Solicitor General, they should call up and find out whether or not he authorized the letter?

I suggest to the minister—

The Speaker: Is this your question?

Mr Callahan: The question is coming, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: Quickly.

Mr Callahan: Despite the fact that the minister himself feels he has done nothing wrong, what does he think

went through the mind of that justice of the peace? What does he think goes through the minds of the citizens of this province in terms of being dealt with fairly by the justice system when he as Solicitor General stands here in the House and refuses to step aside even briefly while the matter is investigated?

Hon Mr Farnan: Let me tell the member that I can only give him some idea. I have been asked the question, what goes through the minds of the people in this province? Well, I can tell the member that the response is very clear from the public. If you have done something wrong if I had interfered with the course of justice, if I had approached a justice of the peace, if I had picked up the phone, if I had gone to the justice of the peace's office, people would understand that there would have to be a sanction, and I can tell the member my resignation would have been on the Premier's desk, period.

However, I did not write a letter; I did not sign a letter; I did not give authority. How many times does it take? I had no part in a letter going to the justice of the peace.

Mr Callahan: It is obvious that the minister does not understand just how sensitive the role of performing in a justice capacity in this province is. It is obvious that he thinks, because he did nothing wrong, that he is entitled to stay on in that position.

The minister has been asked by one of my colleagues to table the second letter that he sent, or his staff sent, to a justice of the peace. In answer to that, he rambled and got all around it. Circumlocution is the name of the game. We have not seen that letter. I implore the minister, even though he feels he has done nothing wrong and feels that the justice system has not been fractured at all, although I disagree with him and I think most people in this province disagree with him, would he table the second letter so that we can see whether it is in the same format as the first one, or does it in fact go further and intimidate a justice of the peace to a larger degree?

Hon Mr Farnan: I can tell the member that the letter I gave to the Attorney General, this letter and documentation were handed over to the rightful group, the rightful people, the RCMP investigators. They have all the information that is relevant to these incidents, and it is up to the investigative team at this stage to decide what must be done with that letter.

1520

Mr Harris: I have a question to the Attorney General. The Attorney General called in the RCMP to investigate this incident. The Attorney General suggested to his Solicitor General that while this incident was being investigated he might want to have counsel retained. If this investigation of this incident did not in any way involve the Solicitor General or investigation of the Solicitor General's role in this, why did the Attorney General suggest that the Solicitor General might want to retain counsel?

Hon Mr Hampton: Let me be very clear in my answer to the leader of the third party. I was asked yesterday by the media if I thought that anyone who might be involved in this investigation, anybody who might be interviewed, should—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Hon Mr Hampton: Anyone who might be interviewed by the RCMP: whether I thought it would be a good idea that he retain counsel, and my answer then and my answer now is that while the RCMP are interviewing individuals involved in this investigation, those individuals have the right to retain counsel and they may want to retain counsel, and that goes for everyone involved, and by retaining counsel, in our society, under our system of justice, it does not mean that you are tainted. It does not mean that you yourself are under investigation. That is a right that we respect under our system of justice, and that is the long and the short of the answer, that and that alone.

Mr Harris: Those who are involved should get lawyers, but nobody is involved, but the Solicitor General should get a lawyer.

I want to ask the Attorney General this: Yesterday, Richard Johnston—well known in the NDP, a former colleague of the Attorney General—said on CBC: that if the Solicitor General had not made it unequivocally clear to his staff that they were never to sign his name to a letter to a justice of the peace, he should resign. I assume this investigation is to find out whether that was communicated clearly enough so that three members of his staff understood that. The Attorney General would assume, would he not, that this would be part of that investigation?

An hon member: Richard calls them as he sees them.

Mr Harris: Because Richard does call them as he sees them, I would assume that error of omission—not that, “I didn’t sign the letter,” not that, “I didn’t know about it”—in not making sure that not one, not two, but three members of the staff clearly understood that they were never to send a letter to a justice of the peace required the Solicitor General to resign. Now, I assume that will be investigated. Would the Attorney General not assume that this will be investigated?

Hon Mr Hampton: Let me try once again to be very clear, for the benefit of the leader of the third party. Under our system of justice, it is not for me and not for the leader of the third party to make any judgements about anyone. It is not for us to make any assumptions about anyone.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Hampton: The leader of the third party tries very hard to confuse the Premier's guidelines with respect to conflict of interest, and the Premier must in the end exercise his judgement with respect to those conflict guidelines. But the Premier's judgement on that issue has nothing to do with an RCMP investigation into certain facts, and that RCMP investigation is into facts. The RCMP do not assume anything about anyone. They do not make judgements about anyone, and I wish the leader of the third party would not make judgements about anyone.

The Deputy Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Ferguson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Subsection 32(e) of the standing orders states, "In putting an oral question, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated," and it goes on and on and on.

Mr Speaker, this issue has been going on for three days. We have listened on this side, not only to the questions but to all the editorial comments from the other side, as well as to opinion. We would like you to examine whether or not the questions that have been put today, particularly by the leader of the third party, are in violation of subsection 32(e).

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Continue the question.

Mr Ferguson: Mr Speaker, we would like you to examine that.

Further, I would like to suggest, due to the repetitive nature of the questions and the answers, in the interests of time, if this is to continue, perhaps we can assign a number to the question and a number to the answer in the interests of time for the members of this House.

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you very much.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Thank you for your comments. I am afraid that many of us have sinned the same way. I will consider this and perhaps, if it is necessary, will give you an answer on it.

Mrs Marland: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: Did I just hear you say that many of us have sinned the same way?

The Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I should delete the word "sin" and replace it by "mistake" or "error."

PETITIONS

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr Carr: I have a petition signed by residents of Oakville and Burlington southeast and area which reads as follows:

"To the Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

"We, the undersigned, beg leave to petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"Noting the increase in the number of jobs lost through layoffs, the rising unemployment rate, the increase in the social assistance case load and in the cost of social assistance programs and noting the deterioration in the province's financial position, urge the government to ban the tax and spend approach to financial management which has dominated the province's fiscal policy for the past five years, an approach which has added to inflationary pressures and reduced the competitiveness of Ontario's industry, and to adopt a policy of restraint to control costs and to provide the opportunity for tax relief."

In short, I say to the Treasurer of the province, read my sign, "No new taxes."

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr Brown: I have a couple of petitions to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to this community,

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely, Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

This is signed by a large number of my constituents. I have been presenting these for four days and have many more to present.

1530

ORDERS OF THE DAY

INFORMATION AND PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

Miss Martel moved resolution 19:

That an humble address be presented to the Lieutenant Governor in Council as follows:

To the Lieutenant Governor in Council:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, now assembled, request the appointment of Tom Wright as Information and Privacy Commissioner for a term of five years, commencing on a date to be named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, as provided in section 4 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

The Deputy Speaker: Would you want to comment?

Mr Nixon: I expected the representative of the government to say a few words about Mr Wright's appointment. Certainly, we welcome the appointment. I am not personally familiar with the gentleman, although I understand that he is present in the chamber today and may very well be introduced by the minister who would be responsible for the appointment.

We look forward to working with him because, having discussed this over many years and having come forward with appropriate legislation and regulation, we now are putting the protection of privacy under this statute in the hands, I am told, of an extremely competent and capable person, and experienced as well.

All I can say on a personal basis is that personal friends of mine know him well and recommend him highly. On that basis, the friends of my friends are my friends, so I

welcome him to this important responsibility and wish him well.

Mr Sterling: I think it is worth while to note that the Premier asked one representative from each of the political parties to interview candidates who had put their names forward for this position, and I congratulate him on doing that. The Information and Privacy Commissioner is not responsible to the Premier, he is responsible to this Legislative Assembly, to make certain that the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act are carried forward. Therefore, I think it is most appropriate that all three parties, the member for Bruce from the Liberal Party, the member for Sudbury from the New Democratic Party, and myself, met on a number of occasions to consider various candidates for this post.

I want to say that, while I am not speaking in any kind of meagre way about the ability of Mr Wright, there were a significant number of other candidates who put themselves forward who were very qualified to take on this position. It was a new process in terms of the three members from the three different parties signing a joint letter on their choice as Tom Wright.

Actually, no one would know this, but Mr Wright was my second choice. I had applied for the job but could not get the other two votes. That is not true, actually, although I did look with some envy when I compared the various pay scales between the two jobs, but notwithstanding that—

Mr Nixon: Your day is coming, Norman.

Mr Sterling: My day is coming.

As you know, Mr Speaker, I have had a long, involved career associated with freedom of information and privacy. Sometimes I thought it was becoming too long and too involved, but at any rate, we have proceeded over the last number of years to a point where the information and privacy commission is blossoming into a more credible, a more substantial instrument of this Legislative Assembly and for the people of Ontario.

Many of the people who might be watching this, or even members of this Legislative Assembly, would perhaps not appreciate, but the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario has more power within his hands than any other freedom of information or privacy commissioner in the world, that I am aware of. He has absolute binding power to release information to a member of the public if he sees fit in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Therefore, it was very important to all members of the committee that we pick a person of high moral integrity, a person who knew the act and who also had significant experience in this area.

Mr Wright has served as the assistant Information and Privacy Commissioner under the former commissioner, Sid Linden. I have every confidence that Mr Wright, and not only Mr Wright but, I think, the excellent staff which Mr Linden has assembled in the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, will do the office well.

The second stage of the whole function of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act is now coming

into blossom, and that is the extension outside of the provincial boundaries to our municipal governments. Members of this Legislature should be comforted by the fact that Tom Wright, before coming to the city of Toronto, practised law in a small rural area of Ontario. I believe that he will not only serve the role well in terms of his ability to deal with a very complicated, a very sophisticated piece of legislation, but I feel that he will also be able to understand and appreciate how small municipalities operate and how they are going to be able to treat the new act which has been thrust upon them by this provincial Legislature.

So I want to congratulate Tom. I want to congratulate all of the candidates whom we interviewed. Tom, it was not an easy choice, but we were very happy with your candidacy. We were impressed with your record at the commission and we think that you can carry the excellent start which Sid Linden has put forward for this province. All the best to you. I hope you have all of the staff that you have had with you before. You have an excellent working team. The best of luck, Tom.

Ms S. Murdock: On behalf of the government, I wish to congratulate Mr Wright on his appointment as well. I can see him up there now. Choosing the Information and Privacy Commissioner was a serious task, and our selection process, I thought, was lengthy and very thoughtful. It was a new area for me, as a novice here in the House and in this kind of committee, and I appreciated much the experience that the member for Carleton provided, as well as the member for Bruce.

In this technological age, I learned that many issues of privacy and information will be coming before us about which the new commissioner will have to have the skill and the foresight to make timely and wise decisions, and we believe that Tom Wright brings us these skills. His experience within the commission from its onset, his administration and management skills will no doubt facilitate much of the predicted load in the future. We want to congratulate Mr Wright, who is up in the Speaker's gallery, and welcome him.

Mr Sterling: I would just like to thank Ellen Schoenberger of human resources here at the Legislative Assembly who helped convene the meeting of the three members. It was no easy task to get the schedules of all three of us together, but she is to be congratulated and thanked by members of the Legislature for her work in this.

The Deputy Speaker: Any there any other members who wish to participate in the debate? The member for Sudbury East.

Hon Miss Martel: Before I call the 41st order, I would just like to describe two agreements that have been reached among the House leaders with respect to the debate on concurrence.

First of all, we would like to divide the remaining time that is left, which is about two hours and 54 minutes, equally between two ministries, the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of the Environment. Second, we would like to take the time that has been allotted to each ministry

and divide that time three ways, so that each party will have an equal opportunity to participate in that debate.

As well, we had hoped to proceed as we had earlier on when we had this debate, which is to not have comments or questions, but allow as many speakers as possible to participate. I understand we only have about 27 minutes apiece, so if that is agreeable to all sides, perhaps that is the best way to proceed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to the member for Sudbury East's request?

Agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: And now I will put the question. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion for resolution 19 carry?

Motion agreed to.

1540

CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLY, MINISTRY OF ENERGY

Ms Carter moved concurrence in supply for the Ministry of Energy.

Hon Ms Carter: I am pleased to have this opportunity to explain the policies and programs contained in the estimates of the Ministry of Energy. I want to outline our aims and discuss the rationale that underlies them. I shall also be discussing the security of Ontario's energy supply and the benefits we expect to see from the energy path we have chosen.

Ontario's traditional approach to meeting rising demand for energy has focused mainly on adding new supplies. As long as new energy supplies were relatively inexpensive and readily available, the simplest answer was to buy more energy or build more power stations.

Today, we recognize that while we were looking for ways to add energy supplies we should also have been looking for ways to use energy much more efficiently and to find renewable sources of energy that would see us into the future.

Ontario is currently one of the most energy-intensive societies in the world. We use 10% more energy per person than the United States and twice as much as Japan and most European countries.

The timing of these new directions could not be better. Recently, demand for all forms of energy, and particularly for electricity, has slowed considerably. This is due partly to the recession and partly to the savings from Ontario Hydro's demand-management programs. We have a breathing space which offers us a valuable opportunity to see what efficiency and conservation can accomplish when they are vigorously pursued.

The lesson from the recession of the early 1980s was that economies that use energy efficiently perform better. They are less vulnerable to cyclical economic downturns and to the shifting sands of the global political scene. The government's goal is to accelerate efficiency improvements in Ontario to enhance our economic performance in both good times and bad.

There is another very pressing reason to adopt energy efficiency: Our current energy consumption rates are not

environmentally sustainable. We all want a healthy, prosperous economy and we all want a cleaner environment. Reducing our energy use can take us a long way towards achieving these goals.

Changing Ontario's energy directions requires a concerted effort throughout our whole society, and the government must do its share. In the coming months, my staff will be developing new or expanded policy and program initiatives. Our goal is to encourage efficiency in energy use right across the board, in transportation, industry, commercial and institutional buildings and in every home. We have introduced measures to improve the energy efficiency of government buildings and operations. This will enhance the government's cost-effectiveness, reduce environmental impact and set an example for people and businesses throughout the province.

My ministry is moving to extend and improve regulations for energy-efficiency standards in household appliances and other energy-using products. These regulations are being developed in consultation with industry to maximize their potential economic benefits.

Recently, the Ministry of Housing joined me to announce a decision to minimize the use of electric heating in non-profit housing and to move to more energy-efficient, cost-effective heating technology. This effort will cut operating costs for those homes as well as reduce the need for expensive new generating stations. As well, the Minister of Transportation recently announced a \$5-billion commitment to energy-efficient transport with increased use of subways, light rail transits, bus ways and ride-sharing.

I now want to say a few words about the issue of nuclear power. The throne speech imposed an immediate moratorium on spending on new nuclear facilities. Ontario Hydro will not spend the \$240 million it had allocated for new nuclear development. Instead, it will redirect that money to electricity efficiency programs. It has reassigned its staff to other duties and renegotiated its contract with Atomic Energy of Canada to ensure that provincial funding is used only for maintenance and improved safety at nuclear stations.

The nuclear moratorium has been widely welcomed, but some have seen it as a threat to the province's energy security. Spending on energy efficiency and parallel generation can now be expected to enhance security far more than spending on new nuclear facilities. The fact is that both the government and Ontario Hydro are concerned about the performance of existing nuclear plants. Our Candu reactors began well. Eight years ago, seven of the eight units at Pickering A and Bruce A were in the world's top 10 for performance. Now, none of them are.

Ontario Hydro's recent business plan reported that nuclear performance has been deteriorating at an increasing rate for the past nine years. The availability of nuclear plants dropped from 90% in 1981 to 62% in 1990. Ontario Hydro plans to spend more money to try to reverse this trend. That and paying for Darlington are the main reasons electricity rates are rising.

In the light of these problems, it is prudent to review the nuclear program and to assess its economic, environmental and social costs before the government commits

itself to building more nuclear plants. The Environmental Assessment Board hearings on Hydro's 25-year demand-supply plan are reviewing the nuclear options and all other options for supplying Ontario's future electricity needs. To ensure a secure supply of electricity, I have asked Ontario Hydro to give priority to early environmental assessments of new and existing hydroelectric projects and to give more emphasis to the development of parallel generation and demand management.

These measures generally have much shorter lead times than the 10 years or more needed to build new nuclear plants. Substantial progress has already been made. Centra Gas and Boise Cascade are working together on a 100-megawatt co-generation facility in Fort Frances. Northland Power is building a 100-megawatt plant in Kirkland Lake and McDonnell Douglas is building one in Toronto. Transalta is building a 65-megawatt co-generation plant in Ottawa.

Independent power producers are investigating many small hydraulic projects all across the province. These can supply significant amounts of power to the province. In all, Hydro has received proposals for 6,000 megawatts of non-utility generation. It has now increased its estimate for the year 2000 from 1,600 megawatts to 2,100 megawatts. My ministry thinks even more can be done and I have asked Hydro to increase its efforts.

1550

Ontario Hydro has also estimated that it can achieve 6,000 megawatts of demand reduction eventually and 2,000 megawatts by the year 2000. Here again we think Hydro can do better and I have asked for greatly increased efforts.

Ontario Hydro has already announced a long string of new energy efficiency initiatives, from a program to improve the efficiency of the entire town of Espanola to a discount on engine block heater timers and its very popular discount on compact fluorescent lights. The municipal utility commissions are working with Ontario Hydro on some of these initiatives. I am especially proud that my home town utility in Peterborough is a leader in promoting energy efficiency and demand management. To reduce peak demand, most of Peterborough's water heaters are controlled and there is a similar program for residential plenum heaters. There is also a water heater tune-up program and a low-flow shower head program.

Overall, I am very encouraged by the support our new energy directions are receiving from Ontario Hydro, the municipal electrical utilities and the general public. The compact fluorescent lamps at Loblaws sold out faster than the manufacturers could make them. To me, this is an indication that the people of Ontario are ready and anxious for new energy directions. The government's initiatives will point the way.

My ministry is taking the lead role in the government's promotion of energy efficiency. We will carry the message to all sectors of the economy and to every energy consumer. We will use our budget allocation strategically to create awareness, encourage change, remove market barriers and measure success. We will continue to work closely with other ministries like Transportation, Housing,

Environment, Agriculture and Food, Municipal Affairs, Government Services and Industry, Trade and Technology to ensure all of them are practising responsible energy use and to help them contribute to the government's new energy directions through their own mandates.

In conclusion, I want to re-emphasize the government's basic tenets about energy. Ontario's high rate of energy consumption, and with it the attitudes that individual consumers bring to energy, must change. We must all become aware of the close connection between high energy use and environmental degradation and the economic renewal that can come from energy efficiency.

In the future, we must discover how to create high-quality jobs and rising living standards in ways that are compatible with prudent, efficient and sustainable energy use. Technology, innovation and individual commitment will play important roles in helping Ontario meet this energy challenge; so will government leadership.

My commitment is that my ministry will lead the way to this new era. We can meet the challenge successfully. Together, we can transform Ontario into a truly energy-efficient and sustainable society.

Mr McGuinty: As my party's Energy critic, it is my pleasure to participate in this debate. I want to take the opportunity at the outset to indicate that I thoroughly enjoyed our estimates hearings. They provide us with an opportunity, and I think I say this for the benefit primarily of those who are watching us on TV. It is interesting that sometimes we forget that. In fact, I got a call last week and someone commented on my appearing—I wish I could say it was complimentary, but it was not.

But for the purpose of those who are watching us, although they are technically set out in order to allow us to review the spending patterns of a particular ministry, the estimates hearings enable us to explore the general policies, directions and goals a ministry is taking. They can be extremely helpful in helping us understand what is going on within a particular ministry.

I am going to offer what I hope to be purely constructive criticism today and I am hoping the minister will receive my criticisms in the spirit in which they are intended. Before I begin, I must also thank the minister for her honesty and forthrightness in providing us with answers on the occasions of the estimates hearings, and furthermore, for following up with written responses to written questions I submitted at the end of those hearings, as time did not permit me to present them during the course of the hearings.

With respect to the information I have obtained, both through the estimates hearings and as a result of statements made by the minister in the House in response to questions and through press releases, I think I can fairly indicate that I am somewhat comforted, but mostly disappointed. I am comforted because the ministry continues to place, and rightfully so, a very high priority on energy conservation and efficiency as a means of reducing demand in the province. The minister also places a very high priority on parallel generation as a means of increasing our supply without having to resort to Ontario Hydro.

To put this in the proper perspective, this is really a continuation of the previous government's policy directions.

It is not, as some might have us believe, a radical departure from what the previous government was doing. I just wanted to read some of the initiatives taken by the previous Liberal government which fall into the area of energy conservation and efficiency and parallel generation.

Some of the things the former government did: It established the Energy Efficiency Act; there was improvement made to the government fleet's average fuel economy; there were amendments to the Power Corporation Act to make Hydro more responsive to public priorities, including conservation and parallel generation.

We released a parallel generation policy statement. We implemented a requirement that Ontario Hydro submit a conservation plan, 3,500 megawatts by the year 2000. I note the minister has increased that. We strengthened provisions of the Ontario Building Code and there were future proposals for the next revision round. There were conservation programs implemented, like the municipal building energy efficiency program and the energy-efficient street lighting program, the industrial energy service program, EnerSearch, the grants and the commercial building energy management program. Parallel generation programs were implemented, like the wood energy program and a co-generation encouragement program.

There were increases in Hydro's buyback rate implemented. There was an end to Hydro advertising for space heating and the establishment of incentive conservation programs. For instance, the Loblaws lightbulb program was implemented.

I think it is quite fair to indicate that the minister, and I am very pleased to report this, is in fact continuing along the same path on which the previous government set out when it comes to matters of energy conservation efficiency and parallel generation.

I am also comforted because the minister, like the previous government, realizes that the matters of energy and the environment are inextricably intertwined. Our extraction, transportation, processing and consumption of energy all have associated with them environmental costs. Our obligation is to minimize and control these costs to the greatest degree possible.

With respect to the production of electricity, and that is a crucial issue in our times, we should keep in mind that there are environmental costs associated with whatever method we use. Hydraulic generation has associated with it floodings, problems caused to flora and fauna and generally to the ecosystems present in the areas. There are also problems associated with native land claims which must be rightfully addressed.

1600

There are problems associated with burning of fossil fuels. When I talk about fossil fuels I am talking about oil, coal and gas. As we all know, there is carbon dioxide emitted by the burning of those fuels. These lead to the production of global warming, which is arguably the greatest environmental problem we face today. Of course, there are acid gases produced as well.

Sometimes we lose sight of these environmental costs. Let's speak about nuclear energy and the environmental costs associated with it. There is always the problem of

safety in dealing with radioactive materials, and there is the problem of disposal of radioactive materials.

It would be irresponsible of us not to recognize that there are environmental costs associated with any means of producing electricity, whether hydraulic, through the burning of fossil fuels or through nuclear energy. If we had a choice we would not use any of these, but at the present time the technology is not available to produce the electricity on the scale required by our province, and we have no such choice.

I want to register now some of my concerns about the minister's directions. Conservation and energy efficiency, and parallel generation, deserve priority, but never to the exclusion of our recognition that even our most optimistic results in conservation efficiency cannot stave off the inevitable. We are going to need more generation, and we are going to need more generation beyond what the private sector can provide. The question is not whether we are going to need more generation, but when we will need more generation. I might put it this way: future generations will require future generation.

The question of timing here is absolutely crucial. The continual, reliable supply of electricity has gone hand in hand with the development of the way of life we have come to enjoy in our province. I think it would be stating the obvious that for industrial and commercial sectors found within this province, keeping in mind their role as employers, those sectors simply could not function without a continual, reliable supply of electricity. The quality of life we enjoy in our homes, our lighting, operating washing machines and heating in many of our homes are all dependent on electricity.

In a nutshell, the continual supply of electricity is essential to Ontario, and it is this government's responsibility, this minister's responsibility, to ensure that supply is maintained. It is my view that this government and this minister are failing to take all steps reasonably necessary to ensure that we have a reliable supply. I intend to discuss this further.

There was a very attractive theory advanced in the 1970s by a couple of Americans, Roger Sant and Amory B. Lovins, US conservationists. They talked about two ways to produce more energy: One, we build new generation facilities or, two, we use the existing supply of energy more efficiently so that we end up with extra energy available for other uses.

Sant and Lovins rightfully maintain that it is cheaper to produce electricity by using it more efficiently than by building more generation facilities, and the minister, to her credit, has referred to this on numerous occasions. And the distinct advantage as well of efficiency is that there are no environmental consequences associated with the energy produced or saved, so to speak, by energy efficiency.

There is no question regarding the theory; there is no question regarding the success engendered by the practical application of that theory. The only question is, and it is a question which arises in every jurisdiction: How much electricity can we actually save through energy conservation and efficiency? That is an extremely important question,

given how vital it is to maintain the reliable supply of electricity in Ontario.

To answer this question we would require empirical studies. We need cold, hard facts from which we can establish realistic targets. To my knowledge, the minister has not provided targets. We need a monitoring mechanism to monitor and revise those targets on a regular basis. To my knowledge, there is no such monitoring mechanism run by the minister. We need specific deadlines by which we can commence construction on new generation facilities, and those deadlines should be very conservative given the stakes, ie, that this province could find itself without sufficient electricity if we ever make a mistake.

Politically, it may be wise not to set targets because then you cannot be accused of not meeting them. But realistically, we need targets, monitoring mechanisms and deadlines by which alternate plans must be put in place. Now, to be fair, the minister has asked Hydro to meet certain goals for energy efficiency in conservation and parallel generation, but she has not established any goals for her ministry. We are going to practise conservation without specific targets. I might put it this way. Conservation without calculation is clearly a cause for consternation. It shows a lack of appreciation for a situation which calls for careful consideration, anticipation and preparation.

The goals imposed by the ministry on Hydro are not based on empirical studies. The minister has not commenced any such studies, to my knowledge. The problem is we do not know if the goals that have been created for Hydro, that have been imposed on Hydro, are realistic. If the minister has overestimated our ability to conserve, our ability to produce additional electricity through collateral generation, then we would be in serious trouble.

I think it is important to recognize that there are several United States jurisdictions where targets were based, as well, on a hope and a prayer and met with failure. In one particular jurisdiction they achieved 10% of the target. What we have, in essence, is the minister conducting a grand experiment where the entire province is a laboratory. We do not have deadlines by which the construction of new generation facilities must begin, and apparently the minister is going to play this by ear, as well.

I am going to make reference to a quotation assigned to the Premier in *Ascent*, a magazine put out by AECL. On page 9 of this particular magazine, fall-winter edition, 1990-91, the Premier is quoted. It says:

"Commenting afterwards on his government's new energy directions, Premier Bob Rae elaborated on the challenge the moratorium poses the province. 'Frankly, the next few years are going to be the test as to whether we can get the demand forecast down,' he told reporters. 'It seems to me that the ball is now in the court of everybody in the province. Everybody in the province will see that if we are serious about energy efficiency and conservation, we can really make it work. That is what the moratorium is all about.'"

The Premier, the minister and myself all have tremendous faith in the power of the people of this province to get involved in matters of concern such as this and to play a crucial role. I think that we have a responsibility, nevertheless,

to consider the possibility that things may not work out the way we want them to.

I want to refer to what I call the Big Green lesson. I made reference to this in the House yesterday. Big Green was a proposition advanced in California in the recent elections. Big Green at the outset was very attractive to the California voters and it met with much praise at the outset. However, as time approached for the election, it lost its popularity and, in fact, in the end it failed miserably. Big Green would have had Californians and those located in particular areas—for instance, it would have prohibited them from using barbecues within city limits. It would have prohibited them from driving cars on fossil fuels in certain districts. In short, it intruded severely into their private lives.

I think there is a lesson to be learned there. I do not want to ascribe any loss of faith in the power of individuals to deal with social concerns such as matters of conservation and energy efficiency, but we have a responsibility to look to that example and to recognize that people may ultimately not be prepared to go as far as is required in order to achieve a dramatic impact in the area of energy conservation.

1610

Concerning the goals that the minister has set for Ontario Hydro, or that Ontario Hydro has set for itself—I am not sure which—with respect to energy conservation and efficiency, as I originally read about the Hydro target, it had set itself a target for 2,000 megawatts by the year 2000. The minister has revised this target from 5,000 to 6,000 megawatts, I believe. With respect to parallel generation, Hydro established a target which initially was 1,000 megawatts by the year 2000. Then it was 1,650. Then it was 2,100 megawatts. Now this, too, has been revised by the minister to 6,000 megawatts.

Now, the minister has, to her credit, admitted that these goals are very ambitious, and I believe she indicated in the House today that she hopes they can even surpass these targets. It is significant that we are talking about the equivalent here of three Darlington when we talk about 6,000 megawatts. But it is one thing to be ambitious and it is another thing to be realistic. Let's look at some of the very real problems that the minister must address in determining whether these goals are realistic.

First of all, I hope the minister recognizes that with respect to Hydro equipment, failure has been and will continue to be a problem. Some failure is not predictable. Nuclear stations have been touted to have a production capacity or production reliability of 80%. In fact, I believe they are hovering near 60%. Darlington has two units which should be up and running and neither is up and running.

The question I would have for the minister is, in setting her goals for Hydro, has she accounted for the possibility of equipment failure? Hydro has indicated that 28% of its plant is to become obsolete over the next 25 years. That is another factor the minister must consider.

We have to look at the time lag, as well, for the construction of new facilities. It takes 10 to 14 years to construct a nuclear plant. If the minister's goals are too

optimistic—and by that I mean we cannot save as much electricity as planned and we cannot generate as much electricity via parallel generation as we planned—the question is, will this 10-year to 14-year cushion still be available?

That is assuming, of course, that the nuclear option was one that we wanted to exercise. The nuclear option is one which is surrounded by emotion. I would encourage the minister to ensure that in bringing her approach to the issue of meeting the supply of energy to be provided and maintained in this province in future years, we not allow emotion to interfere with any of those decisions. That is a luxury we simply cannot afford. The issue is too important.

If this 10-year to 14-year period were not available to us, or if the government of the day does not permit the construction of nuclear, we are going to have to build something else, and logically that would be a gas turbine one. That is the technology which seems to be available to us at this time and which is cleanest in terms of environmental costs, apart from Hydro. It certainly burns cleaner than coal or oil. The problem is that these facilities are considerably more expensive to operate on a day-to-day basis. They produce carbon dioxide emissions and acid gas emissions. We should also account for the fact that controls over carbon dioxide emissions are going to be strengthened as time goes on, and there will be a very real question as to whether we will even be able to run our gas turbines in the future under what I hope will then be stringent controls.

It is interesting that in 1990 Hydro purchased power from the United States in order to slip under the acid gas emission limits. The problem, I would only assume, will be even more aggravated in the future. Again, that will pose an additional hurdle to be overcome by Hydro if it was compelled to only consider the fossil fuel option.

The other problem we would face is the matter of gas pipeline capacity. If we had to build another gas pipeline in order to supply us with the fuel required for the gas turbines, that is a project which requires considerable funding and years to build.

The minister has estimated that the load growth, and I understand it is based on Hydro's estimate, will be 2.5% per year. I am sure the minister understands that this business of estimating load growth is an extremely inexact science. We had 5% growth per year in the past. The average annual load growth during the past 25 years, I believe, has been 5%. In 1979, when it made a 10-year estimate, Hydro completely missed the boat in that it did not account for a recession which occurred in the early 1980s and it did not account for the rapid growth which occurred in the late 1980s.

Also, as an indication of some of the difficulties that can be encountered in making estimates, Hydro originally estimated Darlington would cost us \$3.9 billion. My latest count was \$13.3 billion. To be fair to Hydro, some of that was due to delay and policy decisions of governments, but nevertheless this is a considerable increase.

We have to ask ourselves whether some of the goals that have been set for Hydro in fact are based on the assumption alone that we are energy-wasteful. I do not think

there is any doubt that we are energy-wasteful, but "wasteful" is a relative term and the thinking is, "Since we were so wasteful, then there must be lots to save." But there are a couple of reasons which have to be factored into the fact that we are so-called wasteful. One is based on our climate, our position in terms of geography and the globe. Second, some of it is due to the fact that we are energy-intensive in terms of the resource industries which are located here.

There is an optimistic projection with respect to parallel generation. That places a very heavy burden on private industry. The question I would have is, is this an unrealistic burden? The minister is asking private industry to produce from 5,000 to 6,000 megawatts of electricity. Again, for purposes of perspective, Darlington, a \$13.3-billion facility, produces 3,500 megawatts net. So what we are going to have is a case of entrepreneurs producing electricity.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, how reliable is this source going to be? Businesses have been known to fail, to fold up, to go bankrupt. Owners can lose interest in businesses. In short, the business of electricity production will become subject to the same vagaries as other businesses. Businesses come and go. That may be acceptable for other forms of business located within our province, but I do not think it will be acceptable and I think it could potentially cause disaster if our people living in the province, if our Ontario industries, are relying on energy which is based to a great degree on private enterprise. I think that is a question I would implore the minister to consider carefully and thoroughly.

1620

I think the point I am trying to make is that the minister's projections are extremely optimistic. I wish her every success, but high hopes are simply not good enough when we are talking about electrical energy, something which has kept this province moving in the past and which will play a tremendous role in getting it moving again. What we need here are reasonable goals. We need targets with respect to our conservation capability and parallel generation. We need more research. We need empirical studies that back up those targets and confirm that they are realistic. We have to take advantage of the experience of other jurisdictions. We need cold, hard facts.

With respect to NDP government initiatives that have been advanced to date, I have been, in one word, underwhelmed. I made reference to a number of initiatives in the past in the House. I am just going to refer to a few of them. There is the matter of block rates. The NDP have advocated in the past, prior to the elections, an inclining versus a declining block rate, something which is very worth while of exploration. It is my understanding that this matter is under review. The matter of a general rate increase which was advocated by the minister in the course of the estimates hearings is also under review. Time-of-use rates, another idea worthy of exploration, is under review. The matter of gasoline prices is under review. The matter of energy from waste is under review.

The matter of the nuclear phase-out is an interesting and peculiar promise made—"peculiar" is not the right word—interesting promise made by the NDP in the course

of the election. When Darlington is up and running, 62% of electricity produced in this province will be nuclear-based. It is interesting to consider the possibility of phasing out nuclear power in the province.

The matter of buyback rates is also worthy of exploration. The minister will know to what I am referring when I refer to buyback rates.

We are eagerly anticipating the minister's release of the white paper on global warming and regulations to the Energy Efficiency Act, the matter addressing carbon dioxide emissions. We are looking forward to a rebate program for fuel-efficient cars. We are looking forward to a position with respect to the sale of tritium outside the province.

Mr Jordan: I would like to thank the Minister of Energy for her presentation today, her presentations during the estimates committee meetings and her sincerity in obtaining answers to the questions that we were looking for answers to. They were very difficult questions when you consider them under the policy of the present government.

In 1971 an advisory committee on energy appointed by order in council recommended the creation of a separate ministry to develop a comprehensive and co-ordinated energy policy for the province. The Ministry of Energy was established under the Ministry of Energy Act in 1973. The purpose was to ensure that Ontario had an adequate and secure supply of energy that met the needs of Ontario residents and industry at reasonable prices in a manner consistent with environmental protection. In 1973, that was the purpose of forming a separate Ministry for Energy.

I find it a bit difficult today, as I see it, that we have the Ministry of Energy and Ontario Hydro at a so-called Y in the road. We all want to see conservation, efficiency and good management, but we do not want to see a province that looks like an industrial wasteland. Industry needs that direction that was given back in 1973, which guarantees it, not in thought, not in word, but in facts, laid out in a plan it can accept so that it can afford to invest the kinds of dollars that have been invested in Ontario over the years.

I do not think I can make a mistake in reminding this House and the people of Ontario that it was in fact this good planning, good foresight, over the past years that had a great effect on the development of the province of Ontario. Now, industry in this province has fared as well for many years. It is hard to believe what is happening today, that industry is actually going elsewhere because there is no guarantee that there will be power here 15 years from now. This is hard to accept.

I congratulate my colleague the member for Ottawa South on his presentation. I must say he has used many of the points that I had considered reviewing, but I have others that I would like to put forward to the minister, because I know she will be listening and perhaps, with the new chairman of Ontario Hydro, will consider implementing some of these suggestions.

We are fortunate in the province of Ontario that we have a utility such as Ontario Hydro, its research team, its professional engineering staff, its planning department, its own environmental assessment that it does for transmission lines, for hydraulic sites, for nuclear sites, or whatever.

We are paying for that all now in our Hydro rates. It is all over there at 700 University Ave.

Under this government we have brought a good sector of that to a halt under the word "moratorium." One hundred engineers who are qualified to do research, to implement programs relative to nuclear development in this province, have been rechannelled to conservation. I am sure the type of abilities that they have are not going to be such that they are going to feel comfortable to stay in the employ of this utility. There will be other utilities that will be only too anxious to have them on their staff. If we should continue on this route and lose this trained technical staff and then find in 10 years that we have to start over again, we have lost our connection with Atomic Energy of Canada, which has been working very well, this is a very serious thing. The industry is not only in Ontario; it is in Canada, and the amount of money that we have spent on research to be able to use it in the manner and safety that we have, we should be very proud of. I think, rather than be looking at changing the habits of Canadians, we should be able to stand up and say proudly that:

"I am a Canadian. I live in the province of Ontario. Yes, I have a higher kilowatt-hour-per-person use than some of the European countries, or even some of the Americans, but that is all right. There are many things that cause that. First, I am a Canadian. I am not an American. I am not a European. I have my habits. I have my characteristics," and I can tell members from experience, they are not easy to change. We tried this back in 1967 and we found that we could make the programs, we could do the advertising, but we were dealing with people, not furniture, and to get them to respond and measure the response is very, very difficult. You cannot do it to a degree that you can give to industry a guarantee that you will in fact have the energy when required.

1630

Now, instead of trying to shrink an industry and turn us back to an electrical service, we are now really an electrical industry. If we go back to a minimum service of lights, the computers, the televisions and so on, that type of loading does not give a return on the investment. It costs the same amount of money to come to my house, install the necessary equipment and transformers, metering and so on to get 1,000 kilowatt-hours as it does to get 5,000. There is the difference in the unit cost.

Once you make the connection, you might as well have your market. You are already there, you have your equipment there. Along with that is to have your markets diversified enough that you are not just building generation to meet peak demands that probably last for 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes at night. I think you have to have a positive marketing program that concentrates on the loads that fill the valleys in between. You have to invest in the generators to meet the peak.

I say your marketing program should be directed at what is often referred to as off-peak loads. I can tell the minister that if she uses that approach, her unit cost will be less than if she tries the conservation approach. We have the capital investment and we have to meet our peak

demand. We have to come up with our market directed at loads that are used at off-peak periods.

One very good one that used to be used was the heating of schools, because in the daytime when loads were required for other uses, the schools were full of students and very little heat was required. At night time we monitored them, we had them send in reports to the then government and the Ministry of Energy, and it was a very good program. The accumulation of loads such as that gives you a market for the times when you have the generation available but the demand normally is not there relative to industrial load, commercial and manufacturing.

My suggestion to the minister is that the money she is spending, \$240 million I believe, to try to turn the habits of Canadians into the habits of somebody else be directed to promoting the off-peak loads; that, in conjunction with attempting to shift the peak demands, as I think her present program is working towards—and to shift demand time is not easy.

It is not easy to tell people, "You must go and shop at a different time," or "You must start to work at a different time and everyone should go to lunch at a different time." That certainly will level out your demand curve, but again, it is not a program that you can bring in with a positive effect that will attract industry to this province. It is a program that we should be working with all the time, but to do business with other businesses, as one industry to another, we have to sit down and have a real plan of supply for the future, which I would like to draw the minister's attention to. Her people at Ontario Hydro spent a good many dollars of the people of Ontario preparing a demand-supply plan, which is now before the assessment board for hearings.

For this government to take one of the main anchors, one of the main supplies, out of that supply plan or just ignore it and pull the staff away from doing any preliminary engineering or whatever on it and direct them into another field for which they were not trained, I can imagine the efficiency that she is going to have from working on nuclear plans going over to conservation. It is some adjustment, I can assure her.

If we consider the staff that we are paying for with this utility, they have looked into all aspects, all the different options, and they have looked into the economics of it for the people of Ontario. It has been suggested that it is approximately 10 cents per kilowatt-hour for gas-fired, compared to 3.5 cents for nuclear. There is a publication in the office—I do not happen to have it here—that covers that as relative cost per kilowatt-hour.

Ontario Hydro, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Control Board has not only studied the efficiency of this, it has not only studied the safety of the Candu system, it is ready to bring on the Candu 3, which is a modular plant which can be set up where the energy is required and you are not spending millions of dollars on transmission lines to run 200 miles from where the plant is to where the industry wants to locate. The Candu 3 can be set up in the same proximity as the industry wishes to locate. So there is a lot of working together there, to work with industry over that period of time so that in fact the Candu 3 could be

located in the proper areas of this province. It takes a lot of working together.

If the minister is looking back at why the Ministry of Energy was formed in the first place, it was not to fly in the face of the utility. It was to confirm that the utility had the ability to guarantee a safe supply and dependable supply at reasonable cost to the people of Ontario. I suggest that we would be saving the people of Ontario a lot of money, we would be saving ourselves a lot in relationships with industry, this province would have a future if we would once again get in step with the utility, because to turn a ship in the direction that we are trying to turn it and not be able to give guarantees of results is making negotiations for industry coming to Ontario very difficult.

The idea of blaming the lack of industry in Ontario on the recession or using the recession the other way, for the minister to say, "My conservation program is working," is very dangerous. We do not know, and the minister and the member for Hamilton Mountain, my recollection is, stated at the estimates hearings that they would be monitoring very closely their conservation program. In fact, it was even stated to the then chairman and president of Ontario Hydro, "We plan to monitor this on a monthly basis and be able to advise if we're not getting out of conservation what we had planned to get."

We have asked the minister in the House for those figures. Her answer then was, "It is very difficult to measure conservation." That again is the answer that industry interested in locating in the province of Ontario cannot accept.

I would hope that the minister could see clear to review again the research and studies that went into this 25-year demand-supply plan and really assess it and not fly with a philosophy that nuclear is bad, that it is dangerous, that we should not have it. That is sort of a scare tactic, because there really are no figures or nothing in reality in the province of Ontario to try to try and tell people that nuclear is not good and not safe.

1640

The minister knows herself, when she says it drops from 90% to some 60%, that the vice-president of Ontario Hydro told us at the estimates that they had made the mistake in the beginning in assuming that a plant could be 90% efficient and that the record across the continent was about 65%. They admitted to that, as I recall it, at the estimates hearing, that their original plan that a plant could be 90% was not feasible. So for the minister to say now that it is not acceptable because nuclear energy rather than being 90% has slipped to 65%, when in effect my understanding is that 65% to 75% is about the level of operation when you take shutdown time for maintenance and so on—

If you were just going to run it continuously that is a different thing, but maintenance is required of any system, and many of the reasons for shutdown were not related in any way to the nuclear or the method of creating the steam to run the turbine. The defects were mechanical defects—in tubing, in shafts, in the generator itself—which could happen on a water-driven unit. It could happen because of the size of these units.

I say to the minister, in the interest of the future of Ontario, that we should try to review this 25-year demand-supply plan that is before us, try to look at it in a positive way, look at the nuclear part as an industry, not as something that we are trying to get rid of. We have the raw material, we have the technology, we have the safety built in and we have the waste disposal site, which the minister visited recently, which I understand is ready for approval as a method of storing the waste from our Candu system.

All the bases are covered. We have the energy. We have it right in our province, the raw material, if we want to use it. I believe the Premier indicated during the election that he would in fact, if he were elected Premier, make sure that Ontario Hydro did use uranium from Elliot Lake. If the minister takes that into consideration, along with the time saved and the dependability that we can project out to new industries, that we do have a plan and we can supply them, I think we will see the economy of this province turn around very quickly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Further debate? The honourable member for Mississauga South.

Mrs Marland: Are we going in rotation or are we using our allocated time in one piece?

The Acting Speaker: We are going in rotation. Sorry, I did not see the honourable member for Hamilton Mountain, the Minister of Financial Institutions.

Hon Mr Charlton: I will just take a couple of quick moments to address some of the comments that were made by the member for Lanark-Renfrew just a few moments ago. I will only address the last part of what he said, when he said that the demand-supply plan should be reviewed and considered positively.

I would like to assure the member that we intend to ensure that the demand-supply plan has a complete and thorough review, but it is difficult for us to consider it positively, even based on some of the things the member has set out for us this afternoon. The member should understand, for example, that although Hydro has admitted problems in the operation of the Candu nuclear reactors, all of the planning that is now before the EA is still based on average operation over their lifetime of 80%, not 62% or 60%. If that is good and responsible planning and I am supposed to feel positive about the province's long-term energy future being reliable in that kind of setting, then I do not think that I am being honest with the people of the province of Ontario.

The new energy direction that this government set out in the throne speech last fall is a direction that is designed in fact to create the reliability that we have been rapidly losing over the course of the last decade in Ontario. It is also a direction that is designed to make this province significantly more efficient which, at the same time, will make this province significantly more environmentally appropriate and significantly more competitive in its industrial sectors.

Mr Jordan: An industrial wasteland.

Hon Mr Charlton: A last comment to the member for Lanark-Renfrew: His attitudes may be hard to change, but I want to suggest to him that the attitudes of the people of

Ontario made a significant and dramatic change last September, and that has been reflected in a number of other things that have gone on in this province.

I will turn my comments now to some of the positive aspects of the new energy direction and relate them to some of the things that were said by the member for Ottawa South in his comments a while earlier.

Energy efficiency is and has to be the primary, first, number one priority of this government and any other government in this province in terms of a future direction. The member for Ottawa South suggested—and he was kind enough to come over after his comments to tell us that he had to leave but he would look at our response in Hansard, and I appreciated that—that this government was merely following along with programs that had been initiated by the former Liberal administration. I want to suggest that is far from the truth, but some of the things he said are very true and there is a reason why they happen to be true.

For example, the member suggested that we have not set any conservation efficiency targets for the province yet and that we do not have any empirical, factual data. There is a reason for that. It is true that we do not. We will very shortly. The reason we do not is that in 1986 the select committee on energy suggested that a number of pilot projects be done in the province: one in the residential sector, one in the commercial sector and one in the industrial sector. In four years the former administration failed to proceed with those pilot studies that would have given us the empirical data on which to proceed to set targets and specifically design programs.

Now we have begun that process. In six short months we have begun that process. There will be an entire retrofit of the town of Espanola to analyse the retrofit of residential and commercial buildings.

Mr Brown: You didn't even know it was happening, Brian. This is ridiculous.

Hon Mr Charlton: Who did not know about it?

Mr Mahoney: You.

Hon Mr Charlton: I knew about it. I was there when it was decided. At any rate, the town of Espanola will be completely retrofitted.

Just before its demise the former government set up an industrial efficiency program. Unfortunately, somebody forgot to tell them they should monitor the program as it proceeded. Ministry of Energy staff were out there doing their job along with Ontario Hydro staff as best they could. The program was only capturing 50% of the available energy efficiency. When we got into office, we very quickly noticed that fact and are now proceeding to find out how to get the other 50% that the former government was leaving behind. Interesting concept, to go after it all, try and get all of the energy efficiency and put it all into the system instead of just half of it. Not a bad concept.

Mr Brown: Brian, you can't even get a refrigerator in Espanola.

1650

Hon Mr Charlton: The jokes about refrigerators will likely come until they arrive in people's households, but I am prepared to deal with that.

The member for Ottawa South discussed a number of other matters, and they are all very valid and important matters. Unfortunately, they do not take into account the fact that this government is proceeding with serious initiatives around more than just energy efficiency.

Energy efficiency is important. Why is energy efficiency important? Because it is clean, it is totally environmentally benign, but it also accomplishes a number of other things. A megawatt of efficiency is as valuable as 1.35 megawatts of any other form of generated electricity, at least the Hydro form of central generation which has to be transmitted. That includes the delivery of a megawatt, the reserve margin that Hydro requires and the 10% losses it suffers in its high-voltage transmission.

Efficiency is important, but so too are a number of other initiatives that this government is pursuing. One of those initiatives is parallel generation, and specifically—and the government and the minister have said this repeatedly—very specifically cogeneration.

Why is cogeneration important, and where do you focus cogeneration? Members of both opposition parties have talked about global warming and the need to reduce emissions from combustion of fossil fuels—all very well and true. What does building nuclear plants do about reducing emissions? There are literally tens of thousand of megawatts of potential cogeneration out there in industrial plants that are burning fossil fuels already today. They are already burning the fuels, and if we are not prepared to pursue that cogeneration to use the fuels that are already being burned, and at the same time, because of the profits you create from that cogeneration, to clean up the emissions from that industrial operation, then we are not prepared to take on the global warming problem, and we all know we have to.

The member for Ottawa South also mentioned that the Minister of Energy had said that Ontario Hydro started out with 1,000 megawatts of parallel generation in its plan, increased it to 1,600, then increased it to 2,100, and now the Minister of Energy has increased it to 6,000 megawatts. I have to correct the member for Ottawa South. It was not the Minister of Energy who increased anything to 6,000 megawatts, it was the private sector, which the member for Ottawa South was so concerned about. The private sector has put that 6,000 megawatts willingly and freely on the table. It is not a myth. Some of it may be environmentally unacceptable, and we will have to make those decisions through the environmental process, but the private sector that the member for Ottawa South was so worried about has freely and willingly put those 6,000 megawatts on the table.

Mr Brown: At what price?

Hon Mr Charlton: At the current buyback rate. That is a potential—as the member said, it is equivalent to two Darlington-size nuclear plants. Think about it. It is also better than triple what Hydro said was possible just a short year ago.

It is fair to be pessimistic and it is fair to criticize and there is nothing wrong with that. I spent many, many years over on the other side doing precisely that as a critic. All of

that is fair. That will not change the reality that we have started the initiatives to define in clear, hard terms the real potentials so that we can nail down the specifics of programs in the very near future, programs that will be designed to achieve specific targets for conservation, for parallel generation, specifically for industrial cogeneration, and we will also pursue a whole range of other energy supply alternatives.

I will not have time this afternoon to go into any great depth around the potential for alternatives, but I would like to quickly say, because I see a number of out-of-town rural and northern members sitting in the House today, that when it comes to cogeneration, the members from those small towns and rural areas should take the time some time to drive around their town and just identify—I found it interesting last fall as I did a couple of tours to discover that in every single small town in rural Ontario there is at least one but there is at least one good potential site for cogeneration. In many of those small towns, there are more, some of those towns have four or five, but they all have at least one.

If we were to actively go out and talk to the councils and the local industrial officials about the potential of each of those little sites, think about spreading the jobs that are associated with energy production all across the province instead of having them all at Darlington or at Pickering or at Bruce, spreading them all across the north or all across eastern Ontario or all down through southwestern Ontario. Think about the potential of eliminating the need for high-voltage transmission. Think about the thousands of acres of farm land that we would not have to disturb with those God-awful, ugly transmission towers.

Mr Jordan: That's with Candu 3, Brian. Candu 3 does that.

Hon Mr Charlton: Candu 3? Every one of those little towns I am talking about wants a Candu 3? I would doubt that very much, but I think they might accept the industrial cogeneration that is associated with the industry that they have already got that is already burning fuel, and we might be able to clean up in the process. But I do not think any of those small communities wants a Candu 3. Most of them would tip over if you put a Candu 3 in, because they are that heavy.

At any rate, the potentials out there in the province of Ontario, and especially in small-town Ontario, to produce power right where you need it are huge. This government will pursue those potentials aggressively.

The Acting Speaker: The official opposition's time has expired. I believe the Progressive Conservative Party still has some time.

Mrs Marland: There is so much that needs to be said on this subject with this government's particular approach, but unfortunately, like everything else, we are limited in this House by time.

I want to say that I did have the opportunity of hearing some of the minister's colossal answers during estimates, and frankly, I think that if the public was aware of the mentality and thinking of this government on the issue of supply of energy for the future of this province, if they

really knew what was going on, they would be very concerned. Unfortunately, the public in this province will not know what is going on until they experience frequent brownouts and possibly blackouts.

It is great to have a theory, it is great to set goals, but when they are based on ignorance, there is no excuse for it, and frankly, what we are dealing with here is sheer ignorance. And not only that, we are dealing with a Minister of the Environment who does not even listen when she is given—sorry, Minister. I did not mean the Minister of the Environment, I meant the Minister of Energy. I would not want to say this about the Minister of the Environment. The Minister of the Environment does deal with facts. She does not always consider them the way that I would like them considered since she has become the minister, but I am dealing with the Minister of Energy.

It is interesting, because a nuclear moratorium sounds ideal, and in theory, until you get into the technicalities of what that means, it still sounds ideal. But in reality we have to have a supply of electricity that is guaranteed in this province. I believe that the approach of the New Democratic government today in Ontario might as well take us back to the age of oil lamps and candles.

1700

This minister in estimates contradicted the chairman of Ontario Hydro. That is fine, she does not have to agree with Ontario Hydro, it is an independent, arm's-length organization. But how can a Minister of Energy disagree with Ontario Hydro when she does not even know the differences between different types of nuclear generation? I asked her in estimates whether she knew if there were any similarities between—she was referring to the hazard of nuclear generation by referring to Chernobyl and Three Mile Island. I asked her in estimates if she could tell the committee what, if any, were the similarities between Three Mile Island and Chernobyl and the Candu reactors used in Ontario. The answer of this minister was—and I do not blame her for not knowing—"I cannot go into technical discussion. I know that in some ways Candu reactors are different, but in a lot of ways they are not. I was just using this as an example."

The thing is that you cannot use something as an example unless you know what you are talking about. I would be willing to respectfully suggest that the chairman of Ontario Hydro does know the difference between the reactors at Chernobyl and Three Mile Island, and the Candu reactor. If this minister is disagreeing with the chairman of Ontario Hydro, on whom we depend for our supply of electricity, she had better know as much as he does. That is the area where I have the greatest concern in this ministry in this government today, because we are dealing with a thinking that is not based on the actual facts. We are dealing with a minister, for example, who I understand has about \$52 million in her budget. She has 38% of that set aside for energy from waste.

The Minister of the Environment is in the House today. I wonder what she thinks about 38% of \$52 million being allocated for energy from waste when she has just announced that there will be a prohibition on energy from waste, from burning municipal solid waste. Is this not

interesting? We have two ministries in conflict. One is saying you cannot burn municipal solid waste; another minister has 38% of her budget allocated for energy from waste.

But more important, it is the lack of security in meeting the demand for electricity in the next decade in this province that is at risk here. Security means everything to the economy that drives this province. This is the government of the party who says it protects the workers and it has to make sure that the jobs are there. They can forget about that because the jobs will not be here if industry cannot be guaranteed the security of the supply of their electricity. The fact is that the government cannot guarantee to meet the load demands for electricity in this province in the 1990s based on how much people are going to conserve. It is a pure gamble. We might as well go to Las Vegas and throw the chips in the air. It is an absolute gamble for this Minister of Energy to say, as she has now said on a number of occasions, that the energy we conserve will meet the load demands, and ignore totally the fact that the chairman of Ontario Hydro and his analysts, forecasters, engineers and actuaries are saying: "That is totally untrue, it is totally baseless, it is absolutely false. We will be in a crisis for electricity if we do not have new plants built."

Motion agreed to.

CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLY, MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs Grier moved concurrence in supply for the Ministry of the Environment.

Hon Mrs Grier: I am glad to have the opportunity to speak in this House for the first time in this session about environmental issues. The estimates in which I have just moved concurrence were prepared, as members will know, by my predecessor, the member for St Catharines. When they were debated at committee, I found myself in the rather ironic position of defending estimates which had been prepared by a minister when I was then his critic. I certainly look forward to next year's estimates when I shall stand accountable for estimates prepared by me as Minister of the Environment.

Those estimates were adopted by the committee, and I would like to take the opportunity afforded by today's debate to touch on some of the issues that I know were of concern to members in the debate at the committee, and to share with the House some of the actions and the programs of this government that have been put in place, initiatives that have been begun, all of which speak to this government's commitment to the environment.

I think there are very few people who would disagree that, in the change in government that occurred last September, the public's awareness and consciousness of environmental issues played a very real role. People felt it was time for a change, time for a new approach, time for environmental issues to be part of all the decisions made by government. Certainly, in my responsibilities as minister, I take that responsibility very seriously and I take those demands and those expectations very seriously, as does the whole government.

Our government has started really with four major policy directions when it comes to environmental issues. First and foremost, this is a green government in which environmental concerns will be taken into account in virtually every policy and program. Second, we believe that everyone has a stake in the environment, a right to share in it and a responsibility for its protection. Third, for a sustainable environment, we must shift our direction from a consumer to a conserver society. Finally, we believe that we must focus on prevention strategies to head off pollution of our environment, as well as action programs to clean up existing problems. I want to touch on those four principles very briefly.

When I say that this is a green government, it gives me great pride to serve in a cabinet where there is not just one Minister of the Environment, but where there are a number of other ministries that share my concern about environmental protection and that bring forth policies and programs that take the environment into account. I know that members of this House have heard the Minister of Transportation, in actions that he has taken, indicate that to him the environment is part of the decision-making that goes into his day-to-day functioning. We have just had a debate on the Minister of Energy, who is putting conservation and energy efficiency at the top of the agenda of that ministry.

We have heard from the Ministry of Natural Resources about its initiatives with respect to sustainable forestry and to a greening of the province from its area of responsibility, and we have a Ministry of Municipal Affairs that is examining the Planning Act and seeing how planning and land use decisions in this province can be looked at from an environmental perspective and whether in fact we could have a green Planning Act.

1710

The first major initiative of my government was to initiate a consultation process around a paper that had been prepared for my predecessor and that looked to the Environmental Assessment Act. The Environmental Assessment Act is a very fundamental tool in the decision-making around new projects and in the prevention of environmental degradation as we look at the approval process for various projects, making sure that anything that is approved is approved and designed in such a way that it will not cause problems for future generations.

The Environmental Assessment Act and the values underlying it, that it is important to look at alternatives to a particular project and that it is important to look at alternative ways of proceeding with a project—are something that have been in use in this province for many years but have also been abused in this province for many years, abused because the way in which the act was functioning was not effective, was not efficient and contributed to a slowing down of the decision-making process and to people finding ways around the Environmental Assessment Act instead of its functioning as a tool for better planning and for better decision-making. I give full credit to my predecessor for having initiated a review of that legislation. I was very pleased to be able to put out for consultation the paper that had been prepared on the environmental assessment program involvement project, and to seek public

response to the improvements in the legislation that were recommended by that paper.

The Ontario Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee has been holding public meetings, has been receiving briefs and has been discussing these recommendations broadly across the province. We have got back a great deal of response and a great deal of evidence that certainly have reinforced the need for changes to the act, but as always happens when one undertakes a consultation process, we have also got a lot of comments back on a very broad range of issues and on issues that were not particularly addressed or specifically addressed in the consultation paper. When I receive the report from the EAAC, which I understand will be available to me within the next couple of months, I will then review that report and hope I will be able to bring amendments to the legislation before this House before the end of this year, because there is certainly a broad body of support for seeing amendments that will make the act, not undermine it in any way; not take away from the principles and the values underlying that act, but make it a more effective tool for environmental protection.

I think the wisdom of the Premier in appointing me both minister responsible for the GTA and Minister of the Environment is most obvious when we talk about greening the land use planning process, because of course much of the responsibility of the office of the GTA is in looking at the urban structure of this growing urban area and looking at the kinds of land use decisions that are going to be required of all of us as we plan for the next two decades in this area.

The work that was done by David Crombie in his role as royal commissioner to the federal government and to this government, the reports he has made and the work of our former colleague Ron Kanter in looking at the Oak Ridges moraine and the greening of this area, all of that builds into the amendments to the Environmental Assessment Act and the work the Ministry of Municipal Affairs is doing in looking at the Planning Act, and I think it will take us some distance to changing the way in which we make planning decisions in this province.

Let me just mention in passing that I know these are the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment, but obviously a very important part of the decision-making around the Crombie commission's recommendations was the waterfront trail and the overlaying on the GTA of more green space and linkages. I was very pleased to be able to announce just last week the optimum route for the waterfront trail.

The final thing I want to mention under the greening of government is the work of the round table. The Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy is one of a number of provincial round tables and a federal round table that were established after the release of what has come to be known as the Brundtland commission, the United Nations commission on the environment. That recommendation from that commission talked about the need to integrate environmental and economic decision-making. The challenge paper that had been issued by the round table is now again something that is being widely

discussed and on which consultations are occurring across the province.

I think it is worth reminding the House of that challenge paper and of the six principles in that paper that are the subject of discussion groups, by a native circle, by sectorial task forces that are looking at agriculture, at transportation, at urban development and at the various sectors of our economy and trying to focus on these six principles and looking at how they can be applied within each sector. Those principles fit into the principles of this government that I enunciated when I began these comments.

The first principle is anticipation and prevention of potential environmental degradation; the second principle is full cost accounting; the third is informed decision-making. That is where the concept of a sustainable economy, of the integration of the environment and the economy, come into play. The fourth principle stated in the challenge paper is interesting. It is described as living off the interest, doing better with less, looking at sustainability and how we can avoid using up all of our limited natural resources and how we can make sure that we leave enough for those who come after us. The fifth principle is quality over quantity, one we can all understand; the sixth is respect for nature and the rights of future generations.

I think these are six very important principles and I have been very heartened by the response we have had across the province, by the participation in the discussions of the round table and by the very sincere interest by all segments of society, from the chief executive officers of corporations to municipalities, to individuals in really trying to put the concepts enunciated by the Brundtland commission, by the national round table and by the provincial round table into practice and coming down and getting down to serious consideration of what it actually means, not just in a philosophical way but in a practical way.

The other principle of this government that I want to touch on briefly is the principle that everyone has a stake in the environment, a stake in protecting the environment and a responsibility for protecting the environment. I think we have developed that principle through the consultations that I have described and through our linkages and partnerships with municipalities, with individuals, with community groups and with industrial groups, because only by working together, by building on those linkages and by expanding those partnerships can we make it a reality that we have a healthy environment and a healthy economy.

Of course, the centrepiece for me in that principle is the environmental bill of rights, which I moved in opposition in this House on a number of occasions and which, as members know, the government committed itself to in its throne speech last fall.

I just want to bring the House up to date on the progress of the consultation I embarked upon last December, which has been very intensive, very interesting, and as consultation always is, very illuminating. But again, as one often finds with consultation and as one hears when one asks for consultation from a broad range of spectrums of opinion, it does tend to complicate the issues.

We heard during that consultation process that there were a number of concerns with some aspects of the bill,

that there was a great consensus about the need for such a bill and about some aspects of the private member's bill that I had initiated in opposition, but that there was also a need for some further examination of some of those principles and the definition of the environment; for example, the definition of "public trust" and what "protection of the environment" means when you look at it from the perspective of a bill of rights. That consultation has proved very fruitful and has been ongoing, and I am looking forward to being able to have a bill before the House before the end of this session. Let me continue to put it that way.

1720

The third principle that I want to touch on is one that I think has been of most interest to members of this House and certainly the focus of most of the dialogue during question period, and that is moving from a consumer to a conserver society. I will not reiterate at this point my initiatives with respect to the 3Rs: waste reduction, reuse and recycling. I think all members of this House have heard them on many occasions. I just want to report that the initiatives and the moves that we have taken have been, in fact, very well received, that there is a lot of work ongoing, that there is a lot of support for the directions in which we are moving and that there are many excellent and very worthwhile initiatives happening in municipalities all across this province.

I hope that we can move very quickly to build on the blue box program, to expand it to apartments, to move into the industrial, commercial, institutional sectors, and see a real reduction in the amount of waste that is being produced. I am really pleased with the initiatives that have happened within the greater Toronto area. The statistics of the last couple of months have shown a very real reduction in the amount of waste that is going to landfill. I do not presume to take total credit for that through our 3R programs. The economy and various other things have had a role to play, but I think we have turned the corner and I see a very real response on the part of individuals, industries, institutions and municipalities to getting serious about recycling, reuse and reduction. Recycling has always been easy. Reduction and reuse are harder, but we are getting there.

One thing I do want to touch on is waste management master planning, something that I know many members have been concerned about in their own communities. Like the Environmental Assessment Act, it has been a very open-ended and at times unending process. I know in your own constituency, Mr Speaker, there have been some requests for changes, to which we have been happy to respond, and there has been frustration across the province about the fact that waste management master plans seem to go on for ever and not come to a resolution. I have heard those concerns and I certainly have been working with my ministry, have asked my ministry to review that whole process and to see what we can do to make it more specific, more efficient and less open-ended. I hope very soon to be able to have some discussions with the AMO and with other interested groups around that whole process.

Finally, the principle of prevention and protection is one that I take very seriously. I think that the principle of

protecting our environment is something that has to overlay all of our other actions. As I said during our discussion of our estimates, I have asked my ministry to review the programs that were initiated by my predecessor—the municipal-industrial strategy for abatement, the clean air program and many of the programs that I felt had very long time frames and that perhaps were not effective enough to in fact prevent, but were more controlling programs. That has been an ongoing exercise within the ministry and something that I think will prove very fruitful and will in fact move us closer to elimination of toxic discharges, to remediation of many of the problems that have existed in the past and to a true prevention program.

I was very pleased on behalf of the government to be able to announce that we did not see incineration as a solution to waste management problems. Incineration typifies the blinkers that have been in place in many jurisdictions, the feeling that you could get rid of one problem by transferring it to another, that instead of having a landfill site, you could spew it into the air and then have a toxic landfill site. That is in direct contradiction to waste reduction and waste reuse, but also with an ecosystem approach to planning. I think it is only that kind of an ecosystem approach that will bring us to the point in this province when we do not have to spend our time cleaning up problems of the past, when we can say proudly that we have prevented problems, not just reacted and tried to cure them, and when we can stand tall and say, "Yes, we're leaving behind us an environment that is clean for our children and for our grandchildren."

I know that is the objective of all members of this House, and I look forward to hearing their comments on this resolution as the debate continues.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, Minister, for leading off the debate. There will be no questions and answers, and there is equal time allotment for all parties.

Mrs Sullivan: I want, as I start to discuss the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment, to thank the minister for her participation in committee and for her participation here this afternoon.

I also want to thank the member for Renfrew North for participating in the committee on my behalf, acting as Environment critic. I think that he added not only charm but an incisiveness in his questioning, and expressed for all of us what is a clear commitment to environmental matters, to environmental protection and to the concept of sustainable development. I think that he also provided to the committee an indication of the kind of balance that we hope to achieve in opposition on these environmental matters: to support government actions where those actions are valid; to oppose when there are shortcomings and/or where there is fantasy or perhaps inaction; to propose potential solutions, as we did this morning through private members' hour; and to criticize deficiencies.

I think that our goals on all sides of the House are really environmental protection and enhancement. The understanding we want is that we will have environmentally sensitive economic development and that what is passed

on to the next generation is driven by values that are transcribed into policies and legislation today.

I was also pleased to note, in the Hansard of the estimates committee on the Ministry of the Environment, the minister's recognition of the contribution of the member for St Catharines, the past Minister of the Environment. He had, in my view, been a proactive minister who had taken matters of the environment to the front of the agenda, and I appreciate her remarks relating to his performance.

One thing that I think is interesting, as the minister has pointed out, is that these estimates are of the 1991 fiscal year and there is some irony in debating them less than a month to year-end. But in fact I think that this allows us a scrutiny as the ministry embarks on a new fiscal year, and indeed the minister has indicated some of the directions that she is going to be pursuing over the next period of time. I will want to address some of those as I go through my remarks.

One of the things that I do want to point out and to put on the table to the minister is that during the Liberal Party's stewardship of the environment, the budget increased 208%, from \$312 million to \$650 million. In the 1990-91 fiscal year, the budget increased 22% over the previous year. That gives an indication of the kind of commitment that we put into the environment and the kind of increasing share for the environment that was achieved as budgetary decisions were made.

Naturally, we will be looking forward on Monday to seeing a similar kind of proportional change in the allocation to the Ministry of the Environment under the Treasurer's new budget. Through the past years, the minister has maintained that the environmental budget should be substantially increased year over year, and we will be watching very closely on Monday to see the effectiveness of her advocacy in that area.

The minister came to her position with substantial expectations that were put forward through various documents placed by her party, through the Agenda for People and through a letter of 14 August co-signed by herself and the Premier to major environmental groups in the province.

I would like to just mention some of the issues that were included in those documents and put them before the House today.

1730

The Agenda for People contained the following key promises: immediate passage of the environmental bill of rights; immediate passage of the Safe Drinking Water Act; establishment of a zero discharge rate by the year 2000 for discharge of toxic chemicals into Ontario's lakes and rivers; the reinstatement of a system for refillable pop containers of all sizes; the imposition of packaging taxes on packages that are not recyclable or reusable; the extension of the acid rain program to control all sources of acid gas and to establish a post-1994 program; and a complete overhaul of air pollution laws mandating zero discharge of toxic chemicals into the air by the year 2000.

On 14 August 1990, a letter which was sent, as I have indicated, to environmental groups reiterated all of those previous matters and contained the following additions: a reference to improvements to the motor vehicle emissions

program; a ban on toxic organochloride dumping by the pulp and paper industry by 1993; immediate ban on municipal garbage incineration; an assurance that all beer, ale, wine coolers and Ontario-produced wine and liquor would be sold in refillable containers; an immediate ban on CFCs, with inflexible furniture foam and rigid foam insulation, with a complete ban on all CFCs by 1995.

Those are some of the promises that were made by the government before it became government. The expectations were very high and they were maintained by early statements the minister made in the House. I believe the minister will have to live with that politically, with all of those promises, because frankly she made it all sound easy.

Six months into her mandate she has in fact backed off some of her promises. She has made early and perhaps hasty decisions that I believe she will live to regret, and already I suggest that although she is enjoying being able to work with her people in her ministry with specific expertise, she is not having quite the fun she thought she would have when she took over her new responsibilities.

What looked simple from the outside has become more difficult when dealing with the complications and the complexities of the questions involved, and the evidence of that is very clear on the order paper. There is no bill from the Minister of the Environment. There are bills from the official opposition but nothing from government. The minister has said, "Just watch me." We are. What we see is that there is not a lot there.

What we have heard—and I want to talk specifically about the waste management issue—is what the minister has described as a crisis, where indeed she has added to the crisis. Most reasonable analysts and experts in the waste management field believe that she has botched the job and indeed contributed to the crisis, because we are not seeing an integrated waste management strategy. The minister has approached the issue in bits and pieces, letting her preconceived notions dictate a policy that will not prove to be sustainable.

I would like to just walk through the series of disconnected and inconsistent and contradictory statements the minister has made.

In October of 1990, the minister indicated that the interim sites which were being used in a process to ensure that there would be space during the garbage gap for waste to be put were being taken off the table. At that time, the minister encouraged Metropolitan Toronto to pursue a deal in Kirkland Lake.

In November, the minister said she was going to set up a greater Toronto area authority to identify long-term waste sites for GTA garbage. At that time she indicated she would speed up the environmental assessment process. She also indicated that if there was a garbage gap she would be prepared to use her emergency powers to put waste wherever she wanted it to go. At that time she issued an order for North Simcoe to ship its waste to Wasaga.

In December, she also provided an emergency exemption to the Storrington landfill to end in April while it found a site to ship its garbage to. On 12 December, the minister refused in this House to table sites which were on the solid waste environmental assessment plan list which

were now going to be looked at by the authority. She said the authority would have to deal with that list and only the authority would know.

In February, the minister went to a New Democratic Party convention and said that municipalities should not ship waste from one region to another in a debate on a party resolution. She supported that resolution. On 21 February, she introduced what she called, in a speech, a waste reduction plan that called for source separation and reduction action programs. At the same time, however, she said that there would be no regulations in place, no further guidelines or instructions, until 1992.

Think back to February, at which point she spoke at her party's convention indicating that municipalities ought not to ship waste beyond their boundaries. She applied that rule in April, indicating that the search for long-term waste disposal for the GTA would not be met outside the GTA. Then she turned around 10 days later and indicated that Storrington and the Kingston area can ship their garbage to Ottawa-Carleton and that she would provide a bill in the Legislature to enable them to do that. Once again, no consistency, no bill.

Also in April, on 10 April, the minister issued a news release indicating that the Smithville PCB incineration project met all air emission standards for the province. The following day, the minister turned around and banned municipal solid waste incineration on no environmental or technical grounds but on a philosophical point.

On 12 April, the minister indicated that a wood waste inventory was going to be completed and brought forward so that chipboard and other alternative uses could be put into effect for wood wastes. At that point and in that statement, there was no mention of energy-from-waste alternatives, which her colleague the Minister of Energy is clearly pursuing and funding in terms of the use of waste wood.

The series of inconsistencies has continued from the day that the minister became a minister and, frankly, makes it absolutely impossible for municipalities, for industries, for business, for people who are involved in the waste management scenarios to do any planning at all.

We know that every year 10 million tons of waste is generated in Ontario. We know that close to 50% of that comes from Metro Toronto. We support 3Rs programs and we believe that they would have not become successful had it not been for the eager pursuit by the previous Minister of the Environment.

We will support the minister as she moves into areas that will ensure the expansion and further emphasis on 3Rs programs. But the leadership and the intervention of the minister so far has virtually assured us that we will not be able to deal with our garbage question.

In taking over the responsibility for dealing with waste from the municipalities, the minister has indicated to us that she will have an authority under her direction at some point in time to look after the issues on behalf of the greater Toronto area. None the less, she has still not been able to provide to the House any specific details of that authority's mandate, how it will be funded, at what level, who will be on the authority, who will chair it, and how it will report to the House.

The minister has also said that if Metro's existing dumps become full by 1993, as they are scheduled to do and as every expert has indicated they will do, the minister will simply use emergency powers to pile the garbage even higher, with no environmental assessment. That is a complete reversal of what the NDP said it would do and demonstrates a shocking disregard for the health concerns and other concerns, quality-of-life concerns, of the people who live near the dumps.

1740

The minister has also said she does not think she will have to use those powers. She is confident that her waste reduction programs will allow the dumps to operate within capacity long enough for the waste management authority to find a new long-term dump.

The minister announced, as I have indicated, in Belleville in February, waste reduction programs that have no teeth at all. We know that we will not see the first regulation for up to two years. There is no specific deadline or guideline to meet the source separation and reduction targets which she is demanding. There is no indication of enforcement provisions. There are no guidelines at all, no indication on how individuals or municipalities will conduct waste audits. There is no indication of any expansion of the waste exchange, of commercial and institutional packaging requirements, of the cost of the 3Rs and who pays for them; no indication of any standards or guidelines regarding composting for either large sites or for municipalities; no indication of any requirements that she will put into place regarding the use of the Möbius loop symbol; no indication of any recycled-content standards; no indication of any consultation on these processes; no indication, if material is moving from one industrial site to another for recycling or for recovery, that those materials could be designated as industrial materials rather than waste, to eliminate the regulatory deterrents to cross-sectoral reuse and recycling—none of those things.

As a consequence, people who are attempting to become involved in these programs and industry involving itself in waste and environmental audits have no guidelines, have no assurance that if an environmental audit is completed, it will not be used, by example, as part of a prosecution by the ministry. None of these things have been made clear. All of them are up in the air, and no one can plan.

One of the other things that has been raised by municipalities, particularly in the greater Toronto area, relates to the authority of the garbage authority to grab the reserve that exists now at the municipal level. The minister told Metropolitan Toronto a few days ago not to use its \$5-million reserves to reduce taxes, but none the less the minister had no power to do that, other than the power of persuasion, I suppose. But the issue has been raised by members of the Metro council as to whether that authority will be given the responsibility to usurp municipal reserves that municipalities would otherwise put into 3Rs programs. Municipalities need to know that.

Part of the uncertainty that has been created has been because the minister has not been specific and has not been precise, and because of the uncertainty that she has

created there is a sense that to do nothing is better than spending money and energy when the action may not meet the latest whims of the minister. We know that is happening in many communities.

There has been an appointment of a waste reduction office and a waste reduction office director and an interim manager, we are told, of the garbage authority, but once again the House has not been told who will chair the authority, nor when it will be up and running, and there is also no understanding of how these two offices will be staffed and how their work will be co-ordinated.

Members will recall that in November the minister said that the authority would be responsible for landfill siting, not for 3Rs. Recently there was some speculation that there may even be duplicate mandates here, a duplicate bureaucracy, duplicate processes and duplicate rules, when what is needed is in fact an integrated approach.

In other areas, there is also uncertainty. Members of the cabinet, one no longer a member of the cabinet, plus the Minister of the Environment, have openly speculated about the creation of a deposit system for liquor and wine bottles sold through the LCBO. The uncertainty surrounding those speculations is of major concern. We would like to hear, in fact, a statement in the House from the minister about whether she concurs with some of the recommendations which have been made by her former colleague or whether she concurs with the position of Ontario Multi-Material Recycling Inc that in fact this kind of action would jeopardize the blue box program. Is she concerned, by example, about some of the questions that have been raised by Consumers Glass about the continued operation and viability of its plant in Etobicoke? We need to hear the minister's response on these issues, because without specifics and a clear and precise plan, industry cannot plan and the programs will fail.

There is another area that is of some concern, because the minister in April apparently ruled out all municipal incineration, including energy from waste and resource recovery as part of an integrated waste management study. She appears to have done that without any impact analysis, without any review of the full effect of that decision on the energy and environmental cycle. The Premier, we know, appeared to have written a letter to a person indicating that the energy-from-waste option is under active review. He later withdrew that letter and indicated that it was signed by an autopen.

None the less, the Minister of Energy, in appearing before the standing committee on estimates, was far less clear about where the government stands on energy from waste, and as the member for Mississauga South has pointed out, 38% of the Ministry of Energy's budget is devoted to energy from waste. The Minister of the Environment, however, indicates that she will not approve and will not allow municipal solid waste incineration. Where does that leave the municipality of Peel, in which a \$54-million energy-from-waste facility will be up and running and complete in 1992, scheduled to burn 364 tons of garbage per day, with the energy created from that project to be sold to Ontario Hydro? Will she not allow that project to continue? Is she going to stop construction in

midstream? Surely the people in Peel deserve a response to that question.

There are too many voices speaking here. The result is clearly confusion and uncertainty. The minister spoke today about her clear desire to improve the environmental assessment process. She has indicated that she is hoping to receive from the Ontario Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee a report in about two months relating to how to improve that process. That is a project that I concur with, having gone through very difficult and trying circumstances, costly circumstances, in Halton in relation to our search for a landfill site. The enormous costs which have been placed on our taxpayers in Halton clearly are such that they cannot be borne in most communities.

One of the things that we are concerned about, though, as we look at how this environmental assessment process is going to go through, is how the time lines will in fact add up. She has indicated that there will be a report to her in two months from the Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee. Presumably after that there will be more consultation. Then the minister will have to enter into draft legislation and preparation. Then the minister will be introducing legislation into the House. Presumably there will be public hearings subsequent to that. The legislation would come into effect, and presumably any regulations would be put into effect subsequent to that period.

1750

By mid-1993, there is going to be no landfill site for the entire GTA. The minister has indicated that the garbage authority will not be up and running until legislation comes into effect, after which time it would be able to use a streamlined environmental assessment process. The time lines do not add up. We have not yet even seen legislation relating to the garbage authority and we have seen no legislation relating to the laws, the rules that it will have to follow once it is in operation. It does not add up. The time lines are such that we will be guaranteed that there will be garbage on our doorsteps.

There are many other areas that can be addressed in these environment discussions. I indicated originally, at the beginning of this session, some of the kinds of commitments that the New Democrats made and that the Minister of the Environment has made specifically relating to environment matters. As we proceed through the session, I am hoping that we will be able to debate some of the other things that the minister has indicated she would like to have on the table.

But in fact we have nothing to debate. We have not heard what the timetable or the process is for the development of final clean air regulations. We do not know because the minister, even in the estimates committee, could not define what zero discharge meant and how she would reach that target. We have not heard from the minister what her planning is for the post-1994 sulphur dioxide reductions in the Countdown Acid Rain program. We also do not know what process she is going to put into place to ensure that the next phase of Countdown Acid Rain is implemented. We do not know what new vehicle emission standards will be coming forward, what the process will be for them to come forward and what her timetables for

implementation are. We do not know when the minister will reveal her plans and timetables for implementation and regulation of the federal-provincial NO_x/VOCs agreement. We have not heard what new action the minister is contemplating on CFCs in flexible-foam and rigid-foam insulation. What are her timetables, what are her regulations? We have heard nothing from the minister relating to the decontamination and decommissioning of existing sites.

I raised in the House the issue of X-Pert Metal Finishing in my constituency last week. We have other sites to look at: old landfill sites, abandoned mines—we have seen problems in those areas already—and other industrial sites.

The real test of environmental responsibility is not nice words and lofty goals; it is the action that is taken to achieve those goals. People are prepared to take environmentally friendly action, but they need specifics as decisions are made. Uncertainty must be reduced and action must be clear.

The Acting Speaker: I want to thank the member for Halton North for her participation. That does terminate the time for the official opposition.

Mr Cousens: I am pleased that we have an opportunity in this House to still debate something. The only way in which we can get on the floor is during these special allocated times that allow us to discuss things, because as it turns out the Minister of the Environment has not tabled any legislation since she came to power. We have had since 1 October, and a lot of things have been happening since then outside the House, but when it comes to making determinations of government policy and presenting it, defending it and putting it in the form of legislation that we can debate, it is not happening.

I applaud the minister. You cannot help but like the honourable Minister of the Environment as a person, but the job she is doing and what she has to do really is something where she has to have a balanced understanding of all the needs of the whole community. What I see happening is that the minister will arbitrarily, in her own wisdom, say that Metro's garbage will go into York region. That is a subject I want to spend some time on.

What is the thinking behind this when in fact Kirkland Lake is waiting there to accept garbage from Metro Toronto as an option? Instead of letting there be a full environmental assessment on Kirkland Lake, the minister, in her wisdom, has made the decision that would be made by an environmental assessment. That is wrong, and to compound the wrong is another one. The minister has said, "Well, Kingston can send its garbage to Ottawa-Carleton." Now I have trouble working that one through in my own mind, because on the one hand she is saying it is unthinkable to ship garbage from Toronto to Kirkland Lake, even though Kirkland Lake largely wants it, and yet it is thinkable and her thought process allows for Kingston and The Islands and the Kingston area to send their garbage to Carleton.

There is something very, very seriously wrong when the minister can come along and make these inconsistent announcements outside of the House. We are not seeing

the opportunity in this House to come forward and debate these issues. The minister seems to go into the protection of a scrum outside where the opposition does not have a chance to listen to exactly what she says and to come back and counter it with other arguments.

The minister goes outside the House and says, "I am opposed to incineration," and instead of allowing incineration to go to environmental assessment, so that the scientists can look at it, we have what you call techno-peasants at work. Techno-peasants are ones who allow a policy to be made by themselves without at least opening up the same issues for serious consideration by all the thought processes that people in Japan, or Sweden, or Switzerland, or other countries, or other jurisdictions have gone through when they look at incineration as a possible alternative.

No, we do not have that option in Ontario. Instead we have a minister who says, "We will not have incineration." Now she may be right. I am not one who can question a good authority on this thing, but it is not the minister who is the authority. She is not a scientific fount of knowledge. Why not then throw it out to an environmental assessment? Why not throw out Kirkland Lake to an environmental assessment? Why not open it up to debate and discussion instead of having a close-minded Minister of the Environment who is making decisions on her own and not using the House and the Legislature for that opportunity?

As we go through the decisions that are being made by fiat out of the ministry, we are beginning to see a ministry that is not responding to the kinds of questions we are asking in the House. I now know for sure why we call it question period—because we never get answers. We can ask all the questions we want. When those guys were in opposition they also asked lots of questions. I had some hope that there would be an opportunity for us to hear great things from them. We have heard nothing.

We are waiting for the environmental bill of rights. I do not know when we are going to get it, and maybe we should never get it. Perhaps if it comes out it will be exactly the same thing the member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore provided when she was in opposition; I understand it is going to go through a few changes. But that was then, this is now. The environmental bill of rights is an issue that really has to be dealt with.

There are a number of issues we are all faced with that will come through this government in the due course of time. What I want to know is what its priorities are. There

are priorities for the environment. There are priorities that we all have to take seriously within this House, but we do not have the opportunity to discuss them, not just in a half-hour that is allocated to us now on concurrences. The issues are far greater than we can just deal with in a few minutes' time. Certainly the business in York region is. Certainly the issues right around the province are. Certainly the issues with the 3Rs are. We as politicians and as concerned people—it is Earth Week—want to be involved in this discussion and debate. There is so much to be done that we are in a position to begin doing a great deal of it now.

I would like to go into a number of issues today that have to do with the Countdown Acid Rain program. I want to get into the environmental assessment review program, the whole PCB issue, and there are a number of unanswered questions on that one. The scrap tires continue to pile up or are being buried. This government is collecting the taxes from the province of Ontario, \$5 a tire, and yet what are we doing with the money? It is well over \$150 million now. Less than \$10 million has been spent on the whole business of recycling and experimentation.

The Acting Speaker: Order. Could the member please have a look at the clock. We have reached that time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: I would like to advise the House of the business for next week.

On Monday 29 April at 4 pm, we will have the presentation of the budget by the Treasurer.

On Tuesday 30 April, we will begin the budget debate. The speaker will be on behalf of the official opposition, the Leader of the Opposition.

On Wednesday 1 May, we will continue with the budget debate. This will begin with the leader of the third party.

On Thursday 2 May, we have two private members' projects, the first standing in the name of the member for Dufferin-Peel, the second in the name of the member for Downsview.

On Thursday afternoon, we will continue and conclude the debate on the concurrence of estimates. We will do first, second and third reading of the supply bill for 1990-91 and then we will continue with the budget debate.

The House adjourned at 1801.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 25 April 1991

Private members' public business

Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1991,	
Bill 68	979
Mr Wessenger	979
Mr Offer	980
Mrs Witmer	981
Mr Frankford	982
Mr J. Wilson	982
Ms S. Murdock	983
Mr Lessard	984
Mr Morrow	984
Mr Wessenger	984
Agreed to	992
Lead Acid Batteries Recycling Act, 1990,	
Bill 26	985
Mrs Sullivan	985
Mr Cousens	986
Mrs Mathysen	987
Mr McGuinty	988
Mrs Marland	988
Mr Drainville	989
Mr McClelland	990
Mr Lessard	991
Mr Mills	991
Mrs Sullivan	992
Agreed to	992

Members' statements

Broadcast of question period	994
Mr Daigeler	
George Lawrence	994
Mr Turnbull	
Day of mourning	994
Mr O'Connor	
Children's Aid Society of York Region	994
Mr Beer	
Police services	995
Mr J. Wilson	
Recycling	995
Mr Drainville	
Conservation	995
Mr Ramsay	
Taxation	995
Mr Stockwell	
Earth Day	996
Mr G. Wilson	

Statements by the ministry

Trucking industry	998
Mr Philip	
Alcohol and drug treatment	999
Mr Farnan	

Responses

Trucking industry	999
Mr Mancini	
Alcohol and drug treatment	1000
Mr Beer	
Trucking industry	1000
Mr Arnott	
Alcohol and drug treatment	1001
Mr Carr	

Oral questions

Ministerial responsibility	1001
Mr Nixon	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Scott	
Mr Eves	
Mr Harnick	
Mr Hampton	
Mr Offer	
Mr Sterling	
Native issues	1005
Mr Drainville	
Mr Wildman	
Ministerial responsibility	1006
Mr McGuinty	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Harris	
Northern banking services	1007
Mr Wood	
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Ministerial responsibility	1007
Mr Callahan	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Harris	
Mr Hampton	

Petitions

Economic policy	1009
Mr Carr	
Unemployment	1009
Mr Brown	

Motion		Other business	
Information and Privacy Commissioner	1009	Lead Acid Batteries Recycling Act, 1990,	
Miss Martel	1009	Bill 26	992
Mr Nixon	1009	Mrs Sullivan	
Mr Sterling	1010	Visitors	996
Ms S. Murdock	1010	The Speaker	
Agreed to	1011	Student newspaper article	996
		Mr Hayes	
Concurrence in supply		Mr Mahoney	
Ministry of Energy	1011	Day of mourning	997
Ms Carter	1011	Mr Mackenzie	
Mr McGuinty	1012	Mr Offer	
Mr Jordan	1016	Mrs Witmer	
Mr Charlton	1018	Visitor	998
Mrs Marland	1019	The Speaker	
Agreed to	1020	Visitor	1001
Ministry of the Environment	1020	Mrs Caplan	
Mrs Grier	1020	Question period	1009
Mrs Sullivan	1023	Mr Ferguson	
Mr Cousens	1026	Business of the House	1027
Adjourned	1027	Miss Martel	
		Adjournment	1027
		Lists of members	
		Members and their responsibilities	1028
		Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1031

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 25 avril 1991

Affaires d'intérêt public émanant de simples députés

Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur les accidents du travail,	
projet de loi 68	979
M. Wessenger	
Adoptée	992

A2 ON

X1

003



24 1991

24 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 29 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 29 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 29 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

SCHOOL TRANSFER

Mr Mancini: All members of the Legislative Assembly are aware that over the past months, negotiations imposed on the county with regard to the school transfer matter have been going on. It has been told to me this morning that the mediator who was sent down by the Minister of Education has hammered out an agreement whereby schools will be transferred from the public board to the Catholic board. I am distressed to find out that a single-community school will be transferred from the public board to the Catholic board. General Amherst District High School, one of the oldest institutions in our county, now will no longer be under the jurisdiction of the Essex County Board of Education if the mediator, the school board trustees and the minister have their way.

During Bill 30 hearings, every party in the Legislature—all parties that sit here today—made a solemn promise to the people of Ontario, and that promise was that we would protect single-community schools that were under the jurisdiction of the public school board. Justifiably, the students, the parents, the teachers and the entire community are very upset. We cannot and will not have social peace if we do not keep the solemn promises we make.

ONTARIO ROAD MAP

Mr B. Murdoch: I would like to bring to the attention of this House and the Minister of Transportation the fact that if one examines the new road map produced by his ministry, the population of Ontario seems to be shrinking rapidly. Whole communities have completely disappeared. Where have they gone? What has this government done with them?

The map of Ontario which serves as a guide to everyone in the province, as well as people who are visiting us and those looking for our hundreds of tourist attractions, used to be dotted with all of our small communities. This government obviously feels that Ontario was becoming too cluttered, so it has done away with more and more of these picturesque sites.

One example of this elimination is Proton Station in my riding of Grey. Proton Station straddles Artemesia and Proton townships. It has its own community centre, postal address and supermailbox. Its people lead full and useful lives. By omitting it from the map of Ontario and with no directional sign on Highway 10, its residents feel slighted and ignored.

I would ask that the ministry re-examine the policy of abandoning communities such as these and rediscover them. Will he ensure in future that Proton Station and other villages like it are reinstated on our map and are once again made to feel welcome in the province.

STRATFORD SHAKESPEAREAN FESTIVAL

Mrs Haslam: Friends, Romans, countrypersons, lend me your ears. All the world is a stage and we are but mere players.

Today marks the beginning of the 39th season of one of the foremost theatre companies in Canada, the Stratford Shakespearean Festival. The season officially opens 27 May in the Festival Theatre with one of the most famous tragedies—if we do not count the Liberals' view of the last election—William Shakespeare's Hamlet. Ticket prices start at \$11 and I have placed a copy of our brochure on each member's desk to facilitate their ticket purchases.

Much ado about nothing, they say? Au contraire. With a total of 825 employees, 500 of whom are year-round Stratford residents, the festival is one of the largest employers in the riding of Perth. They generate an estimated \$25 million in taxes and it is estimated that for all services and goods, the economic benefit to Stratford alone is \$100 million. However, if the members would like to see *Much Ado About Nothing*, it opens on Wednesday 29 May.

We in Stratford are proud of our tradition of providing a rich and varied selection of classic and contemporary plays for the public. I invite the members to join Our Town any night, not just on the Twelfth Night, picnic on our Treasure Island, enjoy the opening of Carousel or attend the performance of School for Wives. As the members can see, our 1991 playbill has much to offer.

EARTH WEEK PROJECT

Mrs Caplan: I am pleased to share with members of this House the imaginative and thought-provoking work of grades 3 and 4 students at Crestview Elementary School in my riding. The students presented me with this "Leave Us a Home" mural, which is part of the class Earth Week project. It focuses on the environmental impact of our neglected planet and suggests proactive solutions to help save this earth.

The students began the project by researching the characteristics, habitat and chances of survival of the species of animals and birds shown in this mural. The collages of apartments, houses, the skyline of the city and the hustle and bustle of urban transportation strikingly illustrate the terrible congestion and how it suffocates our wildlife, green spaces, oceans and wetlands.

Lois Law, one of the teachers at Crestview, said the message was simple and clear, "Our urban existence is killing our natural surroundings—leave us a home."

Not only are these students telling us we are responsible for what is wrong with our earth; they are taking responsibility themselves for what can be done to help save our fragile environment. In the third part of the Earth Week project, the children collected money and bought an acre of the endangered Amazon rain forest.

I am proud of the efforts of the students of Crestview Elementary School and I salute their teachers, Lois Law

and J.D. Hetherington. They are to be commended for their creative proactive approach to learning.

1340

TERMINATION AGREEMENT

Mr Jordan: Today, I rise to voice my concerns over an agreement between a dismissed constituency assistant in Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings and the NDP member of that riding.

The people of eastern Ontario are extremely upset that last week an employee who had worked just three months was muzzled with a \$12,000 to \$18,000 settlement. This is outrageous and ridiculous. While many factories in eastern Ontario have closed their doors, forcing people out of work, and others are struggling to make ends meet, this government is negotiating secret deals. The Premier will not even release the content of the agreement so that the taxpayers can see what they are paying for.

Informed sources said the constituency assistant earned approximately \$10,000 for her three months of work. After dismissal, she received another \$4,000 for what the Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings MPP called a paid holiday and now, if members can believe it, the government has agreed to pay her \$10,000 more.

This government should be more worried about children going to school hungry or skyrocketing unemployment rates than unreasonable settlements with disgruntled staff.

EVENTS IN BRANTFORD

Mr B. Ward: It is a great pleasure to bring to the attention of this House two events that occurred in Brantford that involved people from the opposite ends of the wage scale. The first event involved seniors in an organization in Brantford-Brant county called the Dancing Diamonds. It is a round dancing club that held its first diamond jubilee last week. Over 150 dancers came from Brantford and the surrounding area for a day of fun and dancing. Their enthusiasm is a fine example that life does not end when you retire or at the age of 60.

The other event involved 30 cubs from Brantford who earned their merit badges last night. These badges took two to four years to receive and involved five stages before they received them. Their parents are very proud of these young individuals.

I would like to wish both the Dancing Diamonds and the 30 cubs all of my best wishes for their future endeavours.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr Phillips: I rise today to remind the House of an issue which impacts on each of us. It is an issue that I think needs our attention.

In my riding, as across the province, there is growing concern about the employment opportunities for our young people. In just the past 12 months, we have seen unemployment rise from under 10% among this group to over 16.5%. Among young males of this age group, the unemployment rate now is over 20%. There are 100,000 fewer jobs for these people than there were 12 months ago, and another 40,000 of these young people have actually

dropped completely out of the workplace. If we included them, the unemployment rate would have gone from under 10% to over 20%.

We all know how challenging our younger years have been at the best of times, and now we have an environment in this country where there is political and economic uncertainty. Confidence and hope and optimism are fragile commodities at the best of times. They are easily shaken and easily broken.

Our young people are not a well-organized political force that will arrive on our front doorstep quickly, but none the less, they are an extremely important group. Our challenge, and I might say particularly the government's challenge, is to ensure that this generation of young people will not be forced to pay an unfair price for the mistakes of our older generations.

HUNTING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr J. Wilson: My statement today is directed to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation and it concerns the impact upon tourism by the government's decision to allow natives hunting and fishing rights throughout Algonquin Park.

The Minister of Tourism and Recreation is on public record as saying that tourism is "more than just a hobby" for this government.

With that in mind, it is incumbent upon the Minister of Tourism and Recreation to do more than simply make his colleague the Minister of Natural Resources aware of the concerns of Algonquin's tourist operators. If the Minister of Tourism and Recreation is genuinely concerned about the plight of tourism in this province, he will not only bring forward the concerns of tourist operators, but also urge his government to negotiate native land claims that do not adversely impact upon the tourist traffic in Algonquin Park.

If the Minister of Tourism and Recreation views tourism as more than just a hobby, he should begin to take his portfolio seriously and refrain from making flippant remarks such as the one he made recently in Huntsville regarding Algonquin Park. I quote from the Huntsville Forester of 10 April: "We've gotten a lot of publicity for the park, even if some of it is bad," the minister is quoted as saying.

Let me assure the minister that all of the publicity has been bad and all this negative publicity lies at the feet of his government. It is time for him to go to bat for the tourism industry and begin the process of rebuilding Algonquin's troubled tourist trade.

HIGH SCHOOL CAPACITY

Mr Morrow: I would like to address an educational issue which is of major concern to the residents of Wentworth East. In the city of Stoney Creek there are two high schools below the Niagara Escarpment, namely, Saltfleet and Orchard Park. Since Stoney Creek is one of the fastest-growing areas in the province, these schools will soon be filled to capacity.

Currently there is a population of 14,000 in upper Stoney Creek and 9,000 in the neighbouring township of

Glanbrook. This year there is a total of 1,284 students being bused either down the Niagara Escarpment to the Stoney Creek schools or to Ancaster High School in Wentworth county and Sherwood Secondary School in the city of Hamilton. I believe the number of students living in upper Stoney Creek and Glanbrook alone warrants a new high school in upper Stoney Creek.

The other factors that need to be considered are: (1) the fact that Stoney Creek is one of the fastest-growing urban areas in the province; (2) starting in September 1991, Sherwood Secondary School will no longer be accepting new students from upper Stoney Creek; and (3) transportation costs would be saved with the decrease in busing.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Hon Mr Hampton: On Friday 26 April, I requested the Deputy Attorney General, Mary Hogan, to clarify for me details as she knew them regarding the notification of the Ministry of the Attorney General about a letter sent from the Solicitor General's constituency office to a justice of the peace. The following information is the clarification provided to me by Deputy Hogan and an outline of the procedures in place in the Ministry of the Attorney General.

On Friday 12 April 1991, Deputy Hogan received a telephone call from a member of the judiciary. The caller was a judge who contacted the deputy because Chief Judge Linden was out of town. The judge requested the advice of the deputy as to the correct procedure to deal with a telephone call the judge had received from a justice of the peace. The justice of the peace had told the judge he had received information from another justice of the peace regarding a letter allegedly from the Solicitor General. The judge was told this letter regarded a matter before the courts.

After consulting senior ministry officials to determine the appropriate procedure, Deputy Hogan then called the judge and asked that the judge obtain the documentation for the deputy or ask the justice of the peace to send it directly to the deputy for the purpose of an independent investigation.

On Tuesday 16 April, the deputy called the judge, stating that she had not received any information. The judge replied that he also had not received the information at that time but felt it was forthcoming. The deputy informed the judge that she would be leaving for a conference in the United States on Wednesday 17 April and was then going to be at a civil lawyers' conference on Niagara-on-the-Lake on 22 and 23 April.

Deputy Hogan called her office on Friday 19 April and Monday 22 April but on both occasions the information from the judge had not been received by the office.

My first knowledge of the issue of a letter from the constituency office of the Solicitor General to a justice of the peace came after the Premier's office was informed by the media on 22 April. Immediately upon my office receiving a copy of the letter from the Premier's office, it was passed on to the acting assistant deputy Attorney General, criminal law, who contacted the deputy to inform her. Since documentation had now come forth to substantiate

the allegation, the deputy instructed that the Attorney General be briefed regarding the history of the matter and that he be advised that an independent police force, the RCMP, should be requested immediately to commence an investigation into the matter.

1350

Later that day, I spoke with the deputy by phone. She indicated to me that we might be dealing potentially with two letters, given her call from a judge. The deputy attempted to reach the judge on the same day to determine if the letter that was the subject of the media reports was the same letter the judge had called her about on 12 April. The judge informed Deputy Attorney General Hogan that the letter was seen for the first time that day and that it would be forwarded the next day by courier to the deputy with a covering letter. From the information each had at the time, they felt reasonably certain that the information the judge received related to the same incident that had been raised by the media that day.

The deputy did not receive the information from the judge until Wednesday 24 April. The letter was then handed over to the acting assistant deputy Attorney General, criminal law, for the purposes of the RCMP investigation. This was one and the same letter which the media had received on 22 April.

The process in place at the Ministry of the Attorney General was followed. When an allegation of wrongdoing is received by phone, the informant is requested to put the allegation in writing or meet with a ministry official before any action is taken.

The statement of the facts delivered to me from the Deputy Attorney General emphasized that proper procedures had been followed. As a former member of the judiciary, the deputy was acutely aware of the importance of having the facts and of the damage that can be done to people's lives and reputations when action is taken based on rumour or innuendo.

While this process is of long standing, I have asked the deputy to review whether any improvements to it are possible.

This is a complete accounting of the sequence of events regarding this issue as it relates to the Ministry of the Attorney General.

RESPONSES

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: We have listened to the Attorney General with great care. I appreciate the fact that he has sent a copy of his statement over, because the dates and the numbers of letters and the responsibility that has been passed among the officials of the Attorney General's department are complex and will require thorough review.

It becomes apparent, however, that 10 days before the Premier received the anonymous letter indicating that the Solicitor General's office had been tampering with the free actions of the judiciary, the Attorney General's office knew about it. The fact that the Deputy Attorney General did not want to do anything that might foster innuendo or rumour is commendable, except that in this case it was innuendo

and rumour coming from a judge relating to the Solicitor General.

It is incredible in my mind that the Deputy Attorney General would not inform both the Attorney General and the Premier's office without delay. There will be occasion to pursue that, just to see in fact where the information went.

I am quite concerned as well that the Attorney General, in justifying the very, very slow action that he has now described, indicates that the procedure is as follows: "When an allegation of wrongdoing is received by phone, the informant is requested to put the allegation in writing or meet with...[an] official." Now it is interesting that the phone caller was able to get right through to the Solicitor General. I doubt if one of the crazies in the streets, if there are any, would have been able to contact the Deputy Attorney General or any of the officials who would have responded in that way.

I suppose the word "coverup" is barely parliamentary, but for 10 days the government of Ontario knew about this situation, perhaps thought that it would die a decent death until some internal review had a chance to review that matter. Then all of a sudden the letters appeared in the Sun, in the Star, on the CBC and in the Premier's office and elsewhere, so plan A went down the drain.

It seems to me quite clear that the Attorney General, in receiving the advice that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police should be called in to investigate that and perhaps some other things, had no course but to follow that. When he came into the House and said the only reason he did it was that he was afraid he might be pilloried by the opposition was simply an absurd sidebar to what is otherwise an extremely serious matter.

I would say to you, Mr Speaker, that just as the Solicitor General says he is not being investigated, I am sure now the Attorney General and his deputy will say they are not being investigated. But it is obvious that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police will be questioning—I did not use the word "interrogating"—both of those ministers and the deputy and their officials.

It seems to me it would be a very strange series of events if the RCMP, completing its investigation, which we all recognize as independent and professional, were to make that report to the Attorney General, who is the minister who ordered it in the first instance. There is no doubt that there will be paragraphs in that report dealing with the Attorney General himself, who seems to be out of touch with his deputy, and with his deputy herself, who seems to have a strange understanding of what her order of responsibility is. For that reason it seems apparent that the report should not go to the Solicitor General. The reasons are apparent. It should not go to the Attorney General for similar reasons, since he and his staff will be part of that review and that report.

I think it is obvious that the head of the government—I hope he is going to be in here later so that we might pursue the matter with him—should order that the police report be made available to an independent investigator. I think this is the only way that fairness will be done and can be seen to be done.

I would like to point out that since the reference to the RCMP is not for wrongdoing by individuals—in spite of the fact that it is our view that ministerial responsibility is the issue, and not the issue of what individuals did what—but since it is an investigation of an event rather than ministers or deputies, that report, made to an independent investigator, should be made public. We do not want to find a week from now or two weeks from now that the House is spending a lot of its time in question period trying to make such a report public.

I know that the ministers and all people here know that where individuals are concerned, they should be protected wherever possible. But this is a situation involving ministerial responsibility and an investigation of an event. So at the first opportunity I am going to put to the Attorney General and the government to follow the course of action that I have suggested.

Mr Harnick: What is the public's perception of this matter now? We have seen an incident, and the statement attests to the fact that if the media had not been provided with a copy of the letter in question, this Legislature would still not know anything about this matter whatsoever. The media are the only persons who possibly could tip us off, because we waited 10 days and in 10 days there was not a single mention of this.

In 10 days, the Deputy Attorney General, instead of taking steps immediately to go out and get these letters, decided to go to a conference, I believe, in San Diego. She came back and she went to another conference. During this whole 10-day period, the Deputy Attorney General had not even informed the Attorney General of this province of what was going on. The Attorney General was completely in the dark, and I ask, who was minding the store at that ministry? Who is running that ministry? The Deputy Attorney General certainly has not shown much confidence in the Attorney General.

The next aspect of this is, what is the judiciary to expect when an issue such as this arises and the judiciary reports it and for 10 days it does not hear a thing? Why did the Deputy Attorney General not go to the judge with whom she was already communicating and say: "Get me that document. I will come over and pick it up"? It is because she was in San Diego and the Attorney General did not know anything about it.

There was nothing about this even reported to the RCMP for 10 or 11 or 12 days. What was going on in those 10 or 11 or 12 days? Who was looking after this? Certainly the system of justice and the perception that people have about that system of justice had to be badly shattered by this incident, and to date we still do not know the answers. We still do not have an admission of any responsibility by any person on the government side. Not a single person acknowledges any responsibility for what has gone on. I hope the RCMP are more successful in getting answers than we were after one week of examining every person possibly involved; everyone refused to take responsibility.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: I regret the Premier is apparently not attending question period today. There will be an opportunity to pursue this further, of course, and because of his absence I will direct the question to the Attorney General for some additional clarification in his statement.

First, I want his assurance that the first time he heard of the situation, in which a judge had called the deputy complaining that he had been informed by another judge that a justice of the peace had told that second judge that he had received a letter from the Solicitor General's office interfering with a matter before the courts, he knew nothing of that until the Monday on which the matter became the subject for questions in this House.

Hon Mr Hampton: The first time I learned of any letter or any allegation concerning any letter was Monday afternoon after leaving question period.

Mr Nixon: The Attorney General's deputy, although she is his principal adviser is, as everyone knows, appointed by the Premier and has a shared responsibility to the Attorney General and to the head of the government. Not everybody is aware of that relationship, but it is one that works very well. Ministers understand it and deputies understand it.

Can he, on behalf of his deputy minister, tell the House when the Deputy Attorney General first brought this matter to the attention of the Premier or any official in the Premier's office.

Hon Mr Hampton: As I indicated in my statement, there was some difficulty in tracking down the alleged letter, and there was some difficulty in finding out exactly what the contents were in the alleged letter. As a result, no information was communicated regarding the alleged letter to me until Monday afternoon.

Mr Nixon: I was referring to the Premier's office. The Attorney General had already answered the first question, which he had reiterated. I am interested in knowing when there was any communication with the Premier's office, and that is something that will have to be pursued, if not by me, by the RCMP. The Attorney General is aware of that, of course.

The third supplementary—I have to keep track, Mr Speaker; I know that you follow this closely—is can the minister tell the House if his deputy contacted anyone in the Solicitor General's office.

Interjection.

Mr Nixon: What are you talking about?

If the ministers and mentally backbench frontbenchers are not aware of the importance of this matter, then I really think they themselves should be under review. I think it is quite serious that the members opposite are aware that two of their colleagues have done what amounts to a matter that should call for their resignation.

Can the Attorney General assure us that his deputy, and no official of the Attorney General's office, phoned the

Solicitor General or any official in that office to tell them of this matter and seek any informal information during the 10-day delay.

Hon Mr Hampton: I am advised that the Deputy Attorney General, when she received a phone call regarding an alleged letter, conferred with senior advisers in the criminal law division of the Ministry of the Attorney General. They are the only people she conferred with for the purposes of discussing with them what was the appropriate procedure for following up on a telephone call, which was vague at best, as to what the contents of the letter might be.

Mr Scott: I know that everybody wants to take this seriously, because a serious matter it is. What has happened so far is we have now heard that for 10 days the staff of the Attorney General's department knew that a judge had complained about interference by the Solicitor General.

The Attorney General—it is in the statement—was not informed. More surprisingly, the Premier's office was not informed and there will be those in this House naïve enough to believe that if the judge had not slipped it to a reporter, we would never have heard about it. Now that, by definition, is a coverup. I want to ask the Attorney General if there is any other explanation he can give for a 10-day delay—almost two weeks—except for the fact that they were waiting for confirmation from the judge of his telephone call. Is there any other credible explanation that is to be offered?

Hon Mr Hampton: It appears that I need to correct the member for St George-St David. He appears to want to take facts which have been stated and elaborate on them somewhat. I will return to the statement. The judge who called the Deputy Attorney General stated that he had received an inquiry from a justice of the peace. The justice of the peace had told the judge he had received information from another justice of the peace regarding a letter allegedly from the Solicitor General. All right? The judge was told this letter regarded a matter before the courts.

When this matter was checked into, upon returned phone calls to the judge in question, he indicated to the Deputy Attorney General that all he had was secondhand information. He cautioned that he did not know if the alleged letter had any important information in it at all. He did not know if it dealt with a matter that was before the court. In fact, he was very cautious indeed in saying that this may be nothing more than a tempest in a teapot. That is why it was very important to obtain the letter or have the justice of the peace meet with ministry officials to explain what the substance of the letter was.

Mr Scott: This explanation simply is not going to wash here or before any dispassionate member of the public. This is not a piece of idle gossip that wanders into the ministry; this is a judge of Ontario phoning that one of his colleagues has received a letter from the Solicitor General about a case before the court. You do not have to check it out; you have to listen to it, inform the Attorney General, inform the Premier. You could even call the Solicitor General and ask what is happening. The one thing you cannot do is sit on it for 10 days hoping that the judge will forget

about it. The judge did not forget about it; it went to the press and the public became aware of it.

I want to ask the Attorney General if he is satisfied with the procedures in his department. If not, what steps he is going to take to improve them?

Hon Mr Hampton: In answer to the member's long diatribe, I want to point out to him again that several efforts were made by the Deputy Attorney General to contact the judge in question. When those contacts by telephone were made, the judge in question informed the Deputy Attorney General that he did not yet have the alleged letter.

I also want to point out to the member that when the Deputy Attorney General reached the judge in question on 22 April, the judge informed her that the letter he had received on 22 April, not before, from observing the contents, was the same letter that was being spoken about by the media on that very day. There was no effort on the part of the Deputy Attorney General or anyone in the ministry to delay this. The simple fact of the matter is that the judge in question could not get his hands on the letter he had referred to.

I want to say again to the member for St George-St David, he is in a unique position in this because the procedure that I am following within the Ministry of the Attorney General with respect to these kinds of allegations are the same procedures that he followed when he was the minister.

1410

Mr Scott: To be frank, we never had the problem of the office of the—

Interjections.

Mr Scott: We never had an allegation that the office of the Solicitor General tampered with a case before the courts.

Interjections.

The Speaker: We are going to be calm, right, and allow the member for St George-St David to place his final supplementary.

Mr Scott: In this factual context which the Attorney General's statement gives rise to, a judge phones the Deputy Attorney General; that is admitted. The judge says, "A colleague of mine, another judge, has received a letter, allegedly from the Solicitor General, about a case before the courts." What that leads to is some kind of telephone tag and for 10 days—though we are addressing a matter potentially as serious as can be imagined about the separation between the executive and the judiciary—essentially nothing happens; for 10 days.

Now that we have had an explanation from the Attorney General, I simply ask his simple confirmation of this: Will he confirm that the matters at stake in this case, and the treatment of his office and his ministry of them, are also being investigated by the pending RCMP investigation? I want the confirmation that what happened in this 10 days is being investigated by the RCMP as well.

Hon Mr Hampton: In my answer I feel again compelled to correct the member for St George-St David on

his misapprehension of the facts. I again quote the statement. The fact of the matter is the Deputy Attorney General received a phone call from a judge. The judge said, "I have received a call from a justice of the peace who tells me that another justice of the peace has received a letter allegedly from the constituency office of the Solicitor General."

Upon further inquiry, the judge who made the call indicated that this may be a tempest in a teapot. He had no knowledge of what might or might not be in the letter. He had no knowledge if there was anything even serious in the letter. He did not have the letter.

Finally, I want to inform the member for St George-St David that the RCMP have been handed all of the facts with respect to this matter. I expect that the RCMP will follow up and will investigate the alleged two letters and will be able to provide a full report on the matter.

Mr Harnick: My question is to the Attorney General. It is a very simple question. The Deputy Attorney General knew about this on 12 April. The Attorney General was never informed about anything to do with this matter until 22 April. Why not? What was going on in the Attorney General's ministry that they did not want to tell him? Why was he not available to be involved in this from the beginning?

Hon Mr Hampton: As I have already indicated, we receive at the Ministry of the Attorney General many allegations: allegations against crown attorneys, allegations against judges, allegations against municipal politicians, allegations against federal politicians. There is a procedure in place to deal with those matters. The procedure is this: When an allegation is received by telephone, ministry officials request the allegation in writing so that it can be checked out or they request the individual to meet with ministry personnel so that it can be checked out. In this particular case, the information that was desired, the information that we wanted to look at, could not be obtained.

Mr Harnick: I am going to try again. I did not ask him about municipal politicians. All I want to know is why he did not know anything about this for 10 days. That is the extent of the whole question. Why did the Attorney General not know what was going on for 10 days? Why did nobody in his ministry tell him anything about this for 10 days? Why was the Attorney General totally left in the dark for 10 days? I do not know how much simpler I can put it.

Hon Mr Hampton: There is a procedure and a policy in place for the investigation of allegations. We do not make special exceptions when politicians might be the subject of the allegations. The ministry officials, from the top down, followed that procedure in this case, as they have in every other case. They did the appropriate thing.

Mr Harnick: I am going to try again, because I cannot believe that it is the procedure of the Attorney General's ministry, when something like this happens, to hide it from the minister. He cannot expect the people of Ontario to believe that. It is inconceivable.

I want to know what he has done to ask people in his ministry why he was left in the dark for 10 days while this investigation was starting at the level of his Deputy Attorney

General. Why was he left in the dark for 10 days and what has he done about it since then? Surely the Attorney General in this province has to be informed about what is going on in his ministry. Surely when he comes to work he has a desk and a chair to sit at. They do not put in him the closet and tell him to stay there until 6 o'clock. What was he doing?

Hon Mr Hampton: The same answer. When allegations are received, officials in the criminal law division make every effort to find out the full basis of information about those allegations. They invite the informant to provide the information in writing or they invite the informant to come forward and meet with ministry officials. When that information is received and analysed, I am then told about it.

Otherwise, you can have the situation where every time an allegation comes forward, it has to come to the Attorney General, and I may not be in the position at that time to determine if the allegation is a substantiated one, if it is an allegation that is worthy of investigation, if it is an allegation that has any substance to it at all. What happened here was a following of procedure by officials in the Ministry of the Attorney General to determine if the allegation had any substance.

Mr Sterling: I have a question of the Attorney General. No one has suggested that the incidents leading to this investigation had any criminal intent. I want to ask him why he called in the RCMP to undertake a criminal investigation.

Hon Mr Hampton: As I explained in the House last week, when an allegation comes forward, as it did in this case, involving the constituency office of the Solicitor General, it was felt that municipal police forces would not be in an appropriate position to conduct an investigation and the OPP would not be in a position to conduct an investigation, for obvious reasons. Therefore, it was felt that an outside police force should be asked to conduct the investigation to provide all of the facts, which everyone in this House wants very much to see.

1420

Mr Sterling: I do not expect that the RCMP investigation will recommend that the Attorney General lay criminal charges against any individual because, as I say, I do not think anybody has made that kind of suggestion here. Given that there is very small chance that any criminal charges would be laid, can the Attorney General tell me, first of all, when he expects this investigation to be completed?

Hon Mr Hampton: It is hoped the investigation will be completed some time this week.

Mr Sterling: As I said in my previous supplementary, given that we do not expect, as a result of that, any criminal charges will be laid, will the Attorney General assure this assembly this afternoon that he will make the full results of that investigation public so that each and every member of this Legislature will find out not only what happened with regard to the letters that were written allegedly by the Solicitor General's staff but also what happened in his office and what happened in the Attorney General's office? Will he allow the standing committee on

administration of justice or a committee of this Legislature to review the results of that investigation and make recommendations on how he can clean up his office and how the Solicitor General can clean up his office?

Hon Mr Hampton: I resent some of the implications of the member's question. I will repeat again, for his benefit and for other members, exactly what has taken place here. When the telephone call was made by the judge to the Deputy Attorney General, the telephone call was in the nature of a call asking for advice. The judge cautioned again that he was not sure that the letter even existed.

I want to point out again that the appropriate procedures for dealing with these kinds of allegations were followed in this case. I want to say again, in answer to the member, that if the senior advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General, who are quite aware of this case, advise that it is proper to disclose the report, I will disclose the report.

In terms of the member's desire to bring this before a legislative committee, he is as aware as I am of the procedure to be followed if he wants to bring this before a legislative committee.

Mr Sorbara: So far, we know that two letters were sent from the office of the Solicitor General to justices of the peace asking that an inappropriate intervention be made in the matter of a parking violation, a quasi-criminal offence.

So far, we know that almost two weeks ago, on Friday 12 April, the Deputy Attorney General of the province was aware of allegations involving the Solicitor General. We know that at that time a judge in the province of Ontario was aware of the allegations against the Solicitor General. We know that a justice of the peace was aware of the allegations against the province's Solicitor General. We know as well that two senior officials in the Ministry of the Attorney General were aware of these allegations.

Obviously, the person who wrote the letter in the Solicitor General's office was aware of the letters and the more senior person who authorized the writing of the letters was aware of it, and yet we have the Solicitor General saying—

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Sorbara: —that he was not aware, the Attorney General saying that he was not aware and the Premier saying that he was not aware. My question is this, to the Solicitor General. I just want to read to him guideline 24 of the conflict-of-interest guidelines of the Premier.

The Speaker: No, we need a question.

Mr Sorbara: It says, "Where a minister's constituency office undertakes activities in which members normally engage on behalf of constituents, ministers shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that their office as minister is not used to further the interests of the constituent," that is, take reasonable steps to ensure that tickets are not the subject of letters from the Attorney General.

The Speaker: Will the member place his question, please.

Mr Sorbara: What direction did the Solicitor General get from the Premier in respect of this guideline and what

specific steps did the Solicitor General take in respect of his constituency office to ensure that this guideline of the Premier of Ontario was complied with in this situation?

Hon Mr Farnan: As I explained on innumerable occasions last week, both in writing and orally, I have communicated very clearly that there had to be an arm's-length difference between my office and the judiciary. I have re-emphasized that, it has been in writing, it has been oral, and I am prepared to accept the investigation that the RCMP conducts. I have faith in the RCMP that it will examine all of the facts, and indeed we will hear from it later this week.

Mr Sorbara: Apparently the Solicitor General, when he uses the term "arm's length," means that he writes the letter to the justice of the peace saying "Dear Sir." This is not arm's length.

The Premier's guideline says that the minister must take "all reasonable steps," and I want to ask the Solicitor General, first, whether he received any directions from the Premier and, second, whether he feels that the instructions that he gave his staff comply in this instance with the requirement to take all reasonable steps. Did he get any direction from the Premier describing what a reasonable step might be, and does he feel that the steps he took were sufficient? Yes or no?

Hon Mr Farnan: When one has some information and he communicates it both verbally and in writing, I would suggest to the member that these are reasonable steps.

Mr Harnick: My question is of the Attorney General. It is quite clear that he was in the dark about this for 10 days, the opposition was in the dark about this for 10 days, his backbenchers are still in the dark about this. It only came to light because the media brought it to the Premier's attention and the media publicized it, and there is no coincidence to that.

Why did this Legislature have to hear this from the media, when the Deputy Attorney General knew about it 10 days before? Why was it the media that let the public and this Legislative Assembly know what was going on?

Hon Mr Hampton: I want the member to appreciate that what we were dealing with here was a totally unsubstantiated allegation, and even the judge who made the phone call indicated that in the phone call. He indicated we may be dealing with something here that was not worthy of even looking at a second time. Given that is the factual context, the member for the Conservative Party would have us launch an investigation into almost any political figure based upon a totally unsubstantiated allegation, where even the informer says this may not be a substantiated allegation.

Mr Harnick: The Attorney General has told us that the allegation was unsubstantiated, yet it came from a judge. He told us that he has to be very careful about routine complaints, but again I remind him that it came from a judge, so it was hardly routine.

We have had to pull teeth here to get any information. Every time he makes a statement or the Solicitor General makes a statement, we find out a little bit more. In light of

the actions in both his office and the Solicitor General's office with their belated admissions that come out every few days when they have to try to come up with a statement to make them look good, will the Attorney General undertake to provide this Legislature with a complete copy of the report of the RCMP investigation, and will he provide that report to the standing committee on administration of justice for review by that committee? Will he undertake to do those two things?

1430

Hon Mr Hampton: Again, I take offence at the way in which the member has tried to portray this matter and I repeat that the telephone call that was received from a member of the judiciary, a judge, was a telephone call requesting from the Deputy Attorney General advice and direction as to how to deal with information that he had heard about, but that he was not in any position to substantiate and that he had not seen. That is how this matter arrived. To then allege that someone has been kept in the dark is, to me, totally inappropriate and behaviour which should not take place in this House.

Let me say in answer as well that I have said already that when the RCMP report is completed I will take the advice of senior criminal law advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General as to whether it is appropriate to make that report public. If the member wishes to bring this matter before the justice committee, there are procedures which any member of the House may follow and may institute in terms of bringing a matter before a legislative committee. I suggest he do that.

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING

Mr Mills: My question changes direction and deals with the problems of the people of Ontario. My question is for the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Interjections.

The Speaker: We are slipping back into that parliamentary axiom number one, that there will always be questions which people do not like and responses which people do not like. It would be perhaps better if we moved on and gave the member for Durham East an opportunity to place his question.

Mr Mills: As the minister well knows, these are hard times for the people across Ontario and there are a lot of people losing their jobs. In Durham East we are losing jobs to free trade and the recession, and many workers have been laid off. Doubly hard hit are the apprentices, who not only lose their jobs but lose the chance to complete their apprenticeships. The results are devastating. Many apprentices have no job prospects and do not know what to do to support their families or where they can turn for help. What is the minister doing to assist the apprentices who are laid off or facing layoff?

Hon Mr Allen: One of the devastating impacts of the last recession, in the early 1980s, was indeed upon apprentices who were laid off in large numbers and who were very difficult to trace and to help. We have therefore, within these last two months, put in place a laid-off-

apprenticeship initiative, costing some \$6 million, to assist something in the order of 2,000 apprentices.

We have put in place additional staff in order to conduct an active search for those apprentices, because they often disappear from view very quickly. We have, for example, allowed for accelerated in-school training periods for those apprentices so that they can wait out layoff, if necessary. We have also arranged for co-operative employer arrangements to substitute for the original employer. We also are working upon simulated workplace arrangements so they may continue their training.

I want to tell the member, who I know is concerned about his apprentices in Durham, that the way to access this program is to consult with the local Ministry of Skills Development office and that Durham College has a regional office that would help in that regard.

Mr Mills: My supplementary is to thank the minister for a succinct answer that is helping the people I represent in a meaningful way.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Elston: I have a question for the Attorney General. While he has been very evasive and unwilling to answer the questions so far put to him, I wish to put to him again another question which he has failed to answer. With everybody on this list believing that the letters had come from the Solicitor General's office, the JP being concerned enough about it that he contacted a judge and a judge has then subsequently contacted the deputy for instructions, can the Attorney General now tell us when it was that his deputy contacted the Office of the Premier or the Cabinet Office to inform them of this very serious allegation against the chief police officer in the province.

Hon Mr Hampton: To reply again to the member's question, and to set the facts straight, the telephone call that was received by the Deputy Attorney General was from a judge who stated to her that he had heard from a justice of the peace that another justice of the peace had received a letter. He was in no position to tell what was in the letter. He was in no position to state if there was any serious matter surrounding the letter. He merely wanted to know what the procedure was for reporting that.

The process that is put in place is that before these matters are reported, even to me or to anyone else in the government, the information must be provided so that it can be determined if there is a serious allegation or not. That information, unfortunately, was not forthcoming, despite repeated phone calls by the Deputy Attorney General to obtain that information, which simply did not come forth.

Mr Elston: I have another question for the Attorney General relating to the same matter, which he seems to be intent upon avoiding. There is something unreal about the way in which this information is coming out. If it had not been for the media, we would not have found out about this much. If it had not been, I contend, for the RCMP investigation, we would have had no information from this Attorney General today.

I am asking the Attorney General to return to the question which was asked of him now more than half an hour

ago and which he refuses to answer: When was the Cabinet Office and/or the Premier's office informed of these letters by the deputy, which amounted to a very serious allegation about misconduct against the Solicitor General's office?

Hon Mr Hampton: The Premier's office was informed when a copy of the alleged letter was received. The first copy of the alleged letter was received on Monday afternoon. That is when the Premier's office was notified and that is when I was notified, when an actual copy of the alleged letter was received for everyone to see.

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Attorney General. Even though no one in his ministry wants to talk to him and keep him informed, he is the Attorney General. The senior law officers are under his direction. He makes the decisions in his ministry. Will he undertake to this Legislature that he will provide us with a copy of the RCMP report? It is his decision to make. His senior ministers do not come into this Legislature at question period every day. The Attorney General is the one who is here. He is the one who makes the decision—much to his own surprise, I am sure. Will he undertake to provide that document to us when the RCMP complete their investigation?

Hon Mr Hampton: I have already stated that if senior criminal law advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General indicate to me that it is appropriate, I will make the report public.

1440

Mr Harnick: This whole incident is shrouded in secrecy. I do not know what the Attorney General has to hide, but it seems to me that if the RCMP is doing a report that none of us are going to see, why bother? Why does he just stand here and stonewall anyway? Why bother having an RCMP report if he is not going to show it to anybody? Furthermore, the Attorney General knows that unless he refers this matter to the standing committee on administration of justice, it will never get there in a timely way. It will get there after every other piece of legislation is dealt with and this is no longer an issue.

Again, I ask the Attorney General, what is he hiding? Why is he stonewalling? What did he and the Solicitor General do that was wrong that he has to hide this and try to cover it up?

Hon Mr Hampton: In response to the member's question, I merely want to say this: Why would anyone ask for an investigation by an independent police force the day after he finds the contents of the alleged letter, why would anyone call for an investigation if he were interested in hiding anything or covering anything up?

The allegation that has been made is completely absurd. The day ministry officials received a copy of the letter, that very day, I was informed, the Premier was informed, and the next day the RCMP, a completely independent police force, was called in to investigate.

As for the member's other questions, I have already answered them several times. He knows the procedure for bringing something before a legislative committee. He can do that. Senior criminal law advisers will advise me

whether or not it is appropriate to disclose the contents of the RCMP report, and I am satisfied with their advice.

DRIVER EXAMINATIONS FOR SENIORS

Mr Hansen: The question I have is for the Minister of Transportation. A number of senior citizens in my riding have raised concerns with me about the ministry's requirement that when an individual turns 80 years of age he must retest in order to maintain his driver's licence. This is a very unnerving experience in many cases. Is there anything the minister can do to cut down on the problems experienced by seniors in going through this process?

Hon Mr Philip: My senior examiners do give senior drivers preferential treatment whenever possible, in terms of scheduling their driving tests. In addition, recently our driver examiners have taken a special course and some educational programs to help them to address the concerns and the issues of seniors very specifically when they are dealing with them.

Mr Hansen: Many of the seniors who have raised these concerns with me live in rural areas, for example, Grimsby, Vineland, Smithville, in small towns. They restrict their driving to the immediate area, since we do not have any local transportation there, and are not comfortable with having to travel into a city like downtown Hamilton to take their driver's test. Is it possible for the minister to assist them by making provisions for their driver's test to be done closer to home?

Hon Mr Philip: The Ministry of Transportation does have a program of running the tests in rural areas, in small towns. Indeed, such a program could be made available to the member's constituents. If there are seniors' groups in his area that would like to come forward, I would be happy to meet with them and look at the availability of that program.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Nixon: The Attorney General has not been at all certain as to whether the RCMP report due later this week will be made public. He indicated that he would follow the advice of his staff in this matter. We have already indicated that we are less than pleased with the advice that he is receiving from his staff, particularly since they may very well be interrogated and under investigation as part of this incident.

The Attorney General is shaking his head because he does not like the word "interrogated." Presumably police ask questions and it is usually called interrogation. "Investigation" is that they are trying to get all of the facts of this stuff together.

Now just suppose that report indicates that the Attorney General is not well served and does not run an efficient office and that perhaps his deputy minister, being new and having come from the judicial side herself, did not respond effectively under these circumstances. Suppose the report indicates that the Solicitor General should have the responsibility of a minister. Suppose it indicates that he is not well served. Do you suppose, Mr Speaker, that the Attorney General is going to make that public?

Will the Attorney General not give his ministerial commitment that the matter will be laid before this Legislature? It

does not deal with individuals being interrogated. He said so himself. It is an investigation of the whole matter and, as such, it should be made public. Does he not agree?

Interjections.

The Speaker: I am sure all of us are quite calm and relaxed now. "Calm" is the operative word today, and the Attorney General has a brief response.

Hon Mr Hampton: I want to indicate again to the Leader of the Opposition that when the RCMP report is received, I will follow the advice of senior advisers in the criminal law division and the Ministry of the Attorney General, who are very experienced in dealing with investigations of this type, who are very knowledgeable. I will follow their advice as to the appropriateness of whether or not it ought to be released.

Mr Scott: You're running the show.

Mr Harnick: You're a lawyer. You can make decisions. You're the Attorney General.

Mr Nixon: I want to reinforce the interjections and say to the Attorney General that he is supposed to make those decisions. He has indicated that he will accept advice, but as I indicated in my question, would he not agree that it is quite possible that the report might be somewhat critical of the deputy minister herself and the other law officers of the crown? Would he not then consider recommending to the head of the government that there should be an independent investigator, perhaps a retired judge, God help us, whose name has not been associated with the NDP in any way, or anybody else, and that that person receive an order in council giving him that responsibility?

Ms Gigantes: Let's have a royal commission.

Mr Nixon: Mr Speaker, I will speak to you over the shrill interjection of the returned former minister and put to you, sir, that that is a reasonable way for that to proceed. The former Minister of Health is undoubtedly unaware, as she is about so many factual matters, that the police report on a former Solicitor General was tabled in this House. It is a course of action that would be very appropriate. If not tabled in this House, it must surely be given to an independent investigator. Would the minister not agree?

Hon Mr Hampton: I find the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition interesting. I will consider them.

I merely want to point out to him again that the senior criminal law advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General are not people I hired. Some of them are people his government hired. Some of them are people that that government hired. I want to point out, if the Leader of the Opposition is saying that he does not trust their judgement, that judgement was good enough when they were the government.

In terms of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, I have no problem with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I am sure they will do a very full investigation, I am sure that they will come up with all of the information and I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition can have confidence in that himself.

1450

Mr Harnick: My question is to the Solicitor General. Interjections.

The Speaker: I was just recalling how in the standing orders it mentions that for both questions posed and responses provided, they should not be provocative, they should be factual. We are ready to move on to the member for Willowdale.

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General last week told us that he had given his staff certain instructions regarding answering routine correspondence and he indicated that they were to conduct themselves in an arm's-length manner. I would like to know from the Solicitor General what the definition of arm's length is.

Hon Mr Farnan: I have reiterated from the moment that all of this issue was brought up that I have consistently taken it as a principle for myself and for my staff that there must be arm's length between my office and the judiciary. This matter is now before the RCMP investigation. I have absolute confidence in that investigation and I await their results.

Mr Harnick: If the Solicitor General has been consistent in advising his staff and instructing his staff to be at arm's length with the judiciary, how is it that three people in his office all said that it was proper to send those letters?

Hon Mr Farnan: The member is making judgements that I would prefer to leave to the RCMP. I have absolute and total confidence in any findings of the RCMP and I am prepared to accept the findings of that investigation.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Ms M. Ward: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of the Environment regarding her ministry's 3R program. Last November she made a statement in the House about a three-part waste management strategy. The first part of that strategy called for a reordering of the 3Rs of waste management: reduction first, then reuse and then recycling.

In my riding of Don Mills there is widespread support for the blue box recycling program that is run by Metro Toronto. How will programs like the blue box system fit into the minister's new 3R strategy?

Hon Mrs Grier: I am glad to respond to that, because I think all members of this House know how very successful the blue box program has been.

The difficulty was that the blue box program concentrated entirely on recycling, and the hierarchy of the 3Rs is, as I know everyone knows, reduce, reuse and then recycle.

The other difficulty was that blue boxes have hitherto been confined to single-family home owners, and quite frankly the single-family home owners have been doing more than their share in dealing with our waste management crisis.

So I am very glad to tell the member that as part of the waste reduction action plan for my ministry, blue box will be expanded, not only to all regions of the province but to apartment dwellers, and will be built upon as we move

towards the institutional and commercial reduction and reuse as well.

Ms M. Ward: The minister has created an office of waste reduction. What will be the role of this office?

Hon Mrs Grier: The waste reduction office is an office within my ministry whose role is to be both an advocate and an outreach agency dealing with municipalities, dealing with organizations and community groups and making sure that the reduction and reuse and recycling across the province is within a policy framework and is consistent across the province.

There are some very fine pilot projects and work being done in some areas that can be expanded and built upon in other areas, and the waste reduction office will be doing that and will be working very closely with the waste reduction advisory committee, which is a multistakeholder committee appointed by my predecessor, the member for St Catharines, as an advisory group to me and to the waste reduction office.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr Curling: My question is to the Solicitor General. Considering that the actions of the staff of the Solicitor General are under investigation—at least, three members of his staff are under investigation—and considering too that we have learned today further that some members of the staff of the Attorney General will also be under investigation by the RCMP, I would like to ask: Does the Solicitor General not feel, now that all the justice system of Ontario is under investigation, both areas of the Solicitor General's department and also the Attorney General's, that justice will be better served if he steps down?

Hon Mr Farnan: I have always believed in a principle of justice that if somebody does something wrong, he should be punished. I have done nothing wrong, I am prepared for the investigation to examine the facts and I will accept the results of that investigation.

Mr Curling: This is not a precedent-setting situation. Other ministers have stepped down while investigations have been going on. Police officers have stepped down while investigations have been going on. Staff has stepped down while investigations have been going on and been conducted.

I would like to ask the Solicitor General if any members of his staff have stepped down. Have any of these three women—I gather they were women—or staff members who have been cited as having written these letters stepped down or will they step down, and if they intend to step down if he asks them to step down, why should they take the fall?

Hon Mr Farnan: I very clearly believe in waiting for the course of justice to take its course. The investigation is under way by no less than the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Has the opposition not got belief and faith in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

The Speaker: New question, the member for Willowdale.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Willowdale.

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Attorney General. He is prepared to accept the RCMP report, and the Solicitor General, in response to my question earlier, stated that he is prepared to accept the RCMP's investigatory report. Why will the Attorney General not make it public? If he is prepared to accept it and he is going to see it and the Solicitor General is going to see it, why will he not undertake to make it public to the people of Ontario and to this Legislative Assembly?

Hon Mr Hampton: I have indicated already on three occasions today in the Legislature that when the RCMP report is completed and it is reviewed by senior officials in the criminal law division of the Ministry of the Attorney General, and if they advise me that it is appropriate to release it to the public, I will release it to the public.

Mr Harnick: If there are no criminal charges that will be forthcoming out of the investigation and out of the report of the RCMP, will he undertake to make that report public?

Hon Mr Hampton: The same answer to the same question.

The Speaker: New question, the member for York Centre.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Sorry. To the member, I moved too quickly. The member for Perth.

1500

PESTICIDES

Mrs Haslam: I would like to get back to an agricultural issue for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I know that some of the holistic farmers are concerned about their position, and I wondered if he would like to make a comment on that area.

Hon Mr Buchanan: I believe the member is referring to organic farming and the cutback in the use of pesticides and chemicals. I would like the member to know and members of the House to know that the ministry is putting more resources into cutting back on the use of chemicals and the use of pesticides on the farm and throughout the countryside. In fact, it is receiving increased importance in terms of the time of the staff and increased importance in terms of the amount of money that we are spending on that particular program.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before proceeding, members here this afternoon may wish to welcome to our midst the former member for Don Mills, Murad Velshi, seated in the east members' gallery.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Sorbara: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I bring to your attention standing order 22(b), which, if I might read it to you, says: "When two or more members rise to speak, the Speaker shall call upon the member who, in the Speaker's opinion, rose first in his or her place; no debate is permitted on the Speaker's decision."

Mr Speaker, I just noted that at the last minute of question period I was first on my feet to ask the final question. You did recognize me and I cannot quite understand why you would then ask me to defer to my friend the member for Perth.

The Speaker: To the member for York Centre, I appreciate your raising the matter. The rule to which you refer applies to debate; it does not apply to question period. During question period, we must follow a rotation. I would be pleased to draw it to the member's attention at a later time.

I must in passing mention that today we have exceeded our previous high of 15. We had 16 questions during question period today, obviously due to the co-operation of all members.

PETITION

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Mills: My petition is to the Honourable Lieutenant Governor, and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, from a number of my constituents, and it refers to the right of accident victims to sue in a court of law for automobile injuries.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

GOVERNMENT SPENDING CONTROL ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR LE CONTRÔLE DES DÉPENSES PUBLIQUES

Mr Carr, on behalf of Mr Stockwell, moved first reading of Bill 80, An Act respecting Government Expenditures.

M. Carr, au nom de M. Stockwell, propose la première lecture du projet de loi 80, Loi concernant les dépenses publiques.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Miss Martel: I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to suspend the proceedings until 4 pm.

Agreed to.

The House recessed at 1506.

1602

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET SPEECH

Mr Laughren moved government notice of motion number 17, that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am pleased to present the 1991 budget of the first social democratic government in Ontario.

I am conscious of the tremendous responsibility I have to the public and the great trust that has been placed in me by Premier Rae and this government.

This budget has not been an easy one to prepare. We took office in the midst of a recession that is proving to be the most severe Ontario has experienced in the last 50 years. This recession is unlike economic cycles of the past. It is more serious because of the economic restructuring

that is altering many traditional assumptions about the nature of growth and competition.

In the last few months, I have listened to individuals and organizations from across the province. The message has been driven home for me that the world is changing and Ontario is having to change with it. L'Ontario doit avoir une nouvelle vision économique orientée vers le 21^e siècle. Ontario must have a new economic vision to help us move forward into the next century.

We believe that government can and should be active in supporting positive economic change and in ensuring that the costs of adjustment are shared fairly. In this budget, we are putting in place the foundation of a new economic strategy, a strategy which has sustainable prosperity as its central goal and fairness as its guiding principle.

A prosperous and sustainable economy provides secure, well-paid jobs at high levels of employment. It is an economy where the quality, not just the quantity, of economic growth is important. Economic growth must be both environmentally and socially sustainable and all Ontarians must share fairly in prosperity.

Our economic strategy is based on social partnerships. Ontario's ability to increase productivity, adopt advanced technologies and managerial practices, enhance workers' skills and invest in emerging businesses depends on developing new working relationships.

Government has a leadership role to play in creating the conditions which allow labour, business and communities to work out co-operative responses to economic change.

To support our economic strategy, we are committed to managing the public sector in ways that help meet our social and economic priorities through effective fiscal management.

The Ontario economy has been in recession for a year. Job losses to date have already surpassed the levels in every recession since the Second World War. Since last spring, employment in Ontario has declined by about 0.25 million jobs.

This recession has reflected serious structural changes as well as cyclical forces. In 1990, 65% of major layoffs were due to permanent closures, compared to only 24% in the recession of 1982. Business bankruptcies were up 73% in 1990, compared to 24% in 1982.

A modest recovery is expected to begin later this year, with the resumption of growth in consumer spending and housing activity. However, we forecast that real output will decline by 3.3% in 1991 and the unemployment rate will average 10%. Interest rates have started to fall recently, but the decline has been too little, too late. The continuation of a relatively restrictive federal interest rate policy and a high dollar will slow the pace of recovery.

Over the next three years, we are forecasting that real growth in Ontario will average 3.7% annually. Inflation is forecast to remain below 4% throughout this period. The unemployment rate, however, is only expected to decline to 7.8% by 1994. The jobless outlook is unacceptable to this government and we are committed to pursuing policies to fight unemployment.

In 1991-92, provincial expenditures are projected to be \$52.8 billion, an increase of 13.4% over last year. Revenues are expected to be \$43 billion, which is actually \$435 million less than last year. The deficit in our combined capital and operating accounts in this fiscal year is estimated to be \$9.7 billion, up from \$3 billion last year.

The government is convinced that allowing the deficit to rise to this level this year is not only justifiable, it is the most responsible choice we could make, given the economic and fiscal conditions we inherited as a new government.

The recession is causing tremendous hardship for people and families in communities across the province. Ontario has been the hardest hit of any province during this downturn.

We have not received help from our national government. On the contrary, the government of Canada has worsened the recession with its monetary policies and has unilaterally cut back on its commitments to fund such vital programs as social assistance, health and post-secondary education. As a result of measures introduced in 1990 and further extended this year, these federal transfers to Ontario in 1991-92 are projected to be \$1.6 billion below previous commitments.

The federal government has not only abandoned previous funding commitments, it has abdicated its responsibility to promote economic growth during hard times. This government has not done that.

Je pense qu'il est important que les gens comprennent que nous avons dû choisir cette année entre la lutte contre le déficit et la lutte contre la récession. Nous avons choisi la lutte contre la récession et nous en sommes fiers.

1610

I think it is important for people to understand that we had a choice to make this year—to fight the deficit or fight the recession. We are proud to be fighting the recession.

This budget picks up the slack in federal funding for social, health and educational programs. Social assistance costs alone this year are expected to increase by 40% to \$4.9 billion in this fiscal year.

To reduce the deficit, we could have increased personal income taxes for ordinary working people or raised corporate income taxes across the board. We have not done that because we believe such moves would worsen the recession. And by not imposing the provincial sales tax on the GST, we are leaving \$470 million in the pockets of consumers in 1991.

This budget provides direct employment to thousands of people through the \$700-million anti-recession program announced last December. It also provides direct support to people who have lost their jobs. My colleague the Minister of Labour has introduced legislation to establish the employee wage protection program. The government will commit \$175 million in 1991-92 to pay claims retroactive to 1 October 1990. The minister has also announced a \$32.5-million labour adjustment initiative to help workers re-enter the job market and improve their skills.

This is the most aggressive effort in all of Canada to fight the recession.

We are responding to the need for action in areas such as worker protection, pay equity, social assistance reform,

affordable housing and the environment. At the same time, we have made some difficult decisions on program reallocations this year to ensure that these initiatives, which are essential for building equitable and sustainable prosperity, are funded.

We have increased provincial capital spending to \$4.3 billion to support employment and to provide necessary investment in schools, roads and other public facilities that will be enduring assets in Ontario communities.

We believe government has a responsibility to support employment and economic growth in times of recession. As the economy begins to recover, we are committed to balancing the operating account, and this budget presents a fiscal plan to set us on that course.

This year, we are determined to alleviate some of the distressing human costs of recession and to prepare Ontario for recovery. By running a deficit in 1991-92 that is \$6.7 billion higher than last year, we are providing stimulus to the economy and creating 70,000 jobs.

Increasing globalization of corporations, the emergence of trading blocs like the European Community and the spread of new technologies are changing our economy and way of life.

On the plant floor and in the office, the way we work is changing, causing demand for new skills and new approaches to industrial relations. Our workforce and our businesses will need to be flexible and adaptable in the years ahead. Management, labour and government must direct their efforts towards changes that will encourage productivity growth based on high-wage, high-value-added products and services.

Pour jouir d'une prospérité durable, il faut un système économique et social équitable.

Sustainable prosperity depends upon having a fair social and economic system. A dynamic economy requires workers, managers and investors who have the confidence and ability to promote needed changes.

Sustainable prosperity can only be achieved if everybody believes that they will be full participants in economic and social change and will benefit from it. People who are paid fairly, who have a sense of economic security and who feel they are respected partners in the process of change are better able to make a contribution to that process.

Governments have an important role to play in creating an environment of social and economic confidence. For example, our health care system ensures that no one is forced into bankruptcy because of an illness in the family; our social assistance system provides a safety net for people who are unable to work or find a job. We must provide that same sense of confidence and security in our economy.

Ontario has a sound and diversified economic base, with a highly educated, motivated workforce and a well-developed infrastructure. In 1989, the latest year for which data are available, the province had a higher absolute level of output per capita than any of the major industrialized nations. But we cannot be complacent.

I am keenly aware of the competitive challenges facing firms and workers in today's changing economic circumstances. The Canada-US free trade agreement accentuates the pressures for change and imposes limits on our ability

to pursue national economic strategies. With this budget, I am tabling a discussion paper on Ontario's economy in the 1990s which explores the issues of productivity and competitiveness.

Over the coming year we will be moving on a number of fronts to secure and create well-paid jobs.

We will explore ways to increase access to the financial capital needed for future investment in jobs. We want to channel the capital resources of Ontario to finance restructuring and promote regional development.

We will make a major commitment to maintain and improve the infrastructure of Ontario with increased capital spending. Sound infrastructure creates a healthy climate for jobs and prosperity.

We will pursue new approaches to education and training that will encourage workplace flexibility. Ontario's jobs depend on a constant renewal of skills and access to training.

We will take further action to reduce economic disparities and make sure that the costs of economic adjustment are not borne by those least able to shoulder the burden.

I do not have instant answers for all our economic challenges. In a period of rapid change, prefabricated solutions based on old assumptions usually end up responding to yesterday's problems, not tomorrow's opportunities.

We know what our society can achieve when all of us work together. Government alone cannot create sustainable prosperity, but it can start providing the framework and stimulate the strategic investment, both public and private, that will be needed to achieve it. We will work to create the conditions where labour, business and members of the community will come together to find the solutions that work best for Ontario.

To move towards an economy in which workers and businesses are skilled and flexible in effecting change will require new approaches to training, industrial relations and income security. We believe that workers will accept and support economic change if they can be sure that their statutory rights will be protected and that they will have opportunities for training that will enable them to share the benefits of new economic circumstances. The success of an active labour market strategy will depend upon the direct participation of labour, business and government in new partnerships.

As part of our labour reform agenda, the government is committed to reviewing, in co-operation with labour, business and other governments, a range of workplace issues. These include future increases to the minimum wage, pension reform, amendments to the Pay Equity Act and the Ontario Labour Relations Act and reform of the Employment Standards Act, including improved notice of layoffs and severance pay provisions.

Education in all its dimensions must be at the centre of our efforts to achieve sustainable prosperity. From the shop floor to the boardroom, learning is the key to success in finding new technological and organizational solutions. Innovation, made possible through education, will generate greater productivity. Our standard of living depends on it.

Currently, Ontario spends almost \$10 billion a year on a broad range of public education services. This government intends to build on the strengths of the education system by pursuing a vision of lifelong learning whereby a factory or home worker, high school dropout or business executive can continue to learn throughout their lives and be recognized for those achievements. It is time to break down unnecessary barriers between different educational institutions and between our educators and the workplace. By building partnerships, in the context of long-term planning, we can begin to make this happen.

As a first step, the government is moving ahead with important reforms to our system of colleges of applied arts and technology. We will commit \$3 million this year to begin implementation of three of the key recommendations of the recent Vision 2000 report on a renewed mandate for the college system.

First, a College Standards and Accreditation Council will be formed to ensure that college programs are of a consistently high quality across the province. Second, we will be moving forward on a system for fairly evaluating prior learning and experience as credit towards a post-secondary credential. Third, the Minister of Colleges and Universities will be undertaking a feasibility study to examine innovative ways for colleges and universities to co-operate in offering new credentials for advanced training. The minister will be announcing further details.

1620

In addition, we are negotiating a new agreement on training with the federal government. Under the previous agreement, Ontario, with nearly 40% of Canada's labour force, received only about 24% of federal training dollars. This is not acceptable. The federal government must recognize the challenges facing Ontario workers as a result of the dislocation caused by high interest rates, an overvalued dollar, the free trade agreement and the absence of a national industrial strategy. A significant new federal investment in training is essential.

One of the fundamental premises of sustainable prosperity is environmental integrity. A clean and healthy environment is essential to the standard of living we want to preserve and enhance. We have learned the hard way that we are inhabitants of an ecologically fragile planet. We have learned that economic growth is ultimately unsustainable if it neglects the environment and the wise management of our resources.

We must all learn to live by the environmental 3Rs—reduce, reuse and recycle. This year, the government is providing an additional \$28 million to municipalities to help them establish enhanced programs to meet the provincial targets for waste diversion of at least 25% by 1992 and 50% by the year 2000. We are more than doubling provincial support for municipal 3Rs programs over last year.

The government is also establishing a three-year, \$10-million program to assess abandoned mine hazards and to undertake remedial work on known high-risk sites. Regulations soon to be established under the Mining Act will give the province authority to enforce stricter protection and rehabilitation standards for current and future mines.

Using energy wisely is critical to our future prosperity. The government is giving priority to energy efficiency and conservation to protect the environment and to reduce the province's reliance on nuclear power. That is why we have directed Ontario Hydro to increase its conservation efforts, partly by diverting \$240 million it had planned to spend on future nuclear studies. Hydro's spending on demand management and conservation programs will increase from \$102 million in 1990 to \$232 million in 1991 and to an estimated \$320 million in 1992. Hydro will spend more than \$3 billion on energy conservation efforts in the 1990s.

The Ministry of Energy will also be launching a series of new and expanded energy efficiency initiatives that will address many forms of energy use. The ministry's activities in this area will be increased by almost 75% in 1991-92 through the allocation of an additional \$10 million in funding.

To promote greater fuel conservation, we are increasing the rates of tax on gasoline and diesel fuel immediately, by 1.7 cents a litre and by an additional 1.7 cents on 1 January 1992. These measures will raise an estimated \$250 million this fiscal year. We wish to be sensitive to the recession, which is why these increases are in two stages. But the message is clear: We want to encourage the efficient use of energy.

To reinforce the environmental message, I am announcing changes to the gas guzzler tax rates as of 1 July 1991. The current tax rates will be doubled and a greater number of fuel-inefficient vehicles, including sport utility vehicles, will now be included. These changes to the gas guzzler tax strengthen the message that fuel efficiency and environmental impact should be important considerations when purchasing a new vehicle. An additional \$30 million will be generated this fiscal year.

Public capital expenditures contribute directly to building healthy, livable communities. Public capital projects make Ontario communities more productive and attractive to private sector investment.

The \$4.3 billion for capital expenditures in 1991-92 includes transfer payments to help meet the capital needs of hospitals, school boards, universities, colleges and municipalities, as well as direct expenditures by the government on buildings, roads, public transit, bridges and water and sewer systems.

Provincial capital spending will play an important role in providing the infrastructure needed for both cyclical recovery and long-term structural change and will support 50,000 jobs in 1991-92.

As part of our emphasis on investing in sustainable prosperity, we are proceeding with the massive Let's Move transit program for the greater Toronto area and providing funding for the Toronto Transit Commission to improve system reliability and to purchase new subway cars.

Initial funding of more than \$48 million is being provided for these initiatives in 1991-92. About \$11 million of this funding will be used for environmental assessments to ensure that our transit strategy proceeds on an environmentally sound basis. The Let's Move program will involve public and private sector funding of more than \$5 billion over the next 10 to 15 years.

Increasing investment in the development and application of new technologies is integral to achieving sustainable prosperity. Product and process innovations are key elements of success in both domestic and international markets, and thus in securing high-value-added, high-wage employment.

Ontario's traditional emphasis has been on tax-based incentives for research and development. Currently, the combined federal-provincial incentives available to companies which operate in Ontario are more generous than those of other major industrial countries.

Even with favourable tax treatment, research and development in Ontario is well below the levels found in most other industrial economies. We must initiate a broader range of policies, from joint venture and sector-specific co-operation to research incentives and new forms of worker involvement. Technological change depends on introducing the partnerships which support a culture of innovation. It requires the hands-on participation of all economic players.

Ontario's technology fund will provide \$131 million for research, development and technology diffusion in 1991-92. That includes \$81 million for programs to support leading-edge research in such areas as robotics, telecommunications and biotechnology, and \$50 million for the R&D superallowance to provide tax incentives for private sector research and development.

As suggested by the standing committee on finance and economic affairs, we will be addressing the critical shortage of investment capital for new high-technology firms. The annual funding for the Innovation Ontario Corp will be increased significantly to almost \$21 million. The ceiling for individual investments by Innovation Ontario will be raised to \$1 million from \$350,000, enabling the corporation to invest in the continuing growth of high-technology firms.

There are some small and medium-sized manufacturing firms in Ontario which are fundamentally viable but which are having financial difficulties because of the recession and high interest rates. These are firms which provide quality jobs with solid future prospects. They have long-run strategic value to our economy.

To assist such firms, the government has initiated a manufacturing recovery program. Viable small and medium-sized manufacturing firms applying in 1991-92 will be eligible to participate. We will provide up to \$57 million in financial assistance, mainly in the form of loans and loan guarantees. My colleague the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology will be announcing details in the coming weeks.

There are few who would question that our farming community has been suffering. The hardships imposed by the recession are compounding the difficulties that were already being experienced as a result of structural adjustment, unstable commodity prices and high interest rates.

The future viability of our agricultural community is vital to the sustainable prosperity of Ontario. Farming is one of our core industries which must be maintained. It is also the mainstay of much of rural Ontario. When farmers

are hurting financially, towns and villages across the province feel the burden too.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food has announced two programs to assist farmers. We have committed almost \$40 million in 1991-92 to the gross revenue insurance program, an income stabilization program for grain, oilseed and horticulture producers. In addition, the farm interest assistance program will provide \$50 million in interest rate relief this year for interest costs incurred by farmers during 1990.

Many people overlook the economic impact of our cultural industry. Culture is appreciated for its artistic value and for its capacity to help us understand ourselves. We should also recognize that it is an important and growing industry, employing more than 75,000 people in Ontario.

1630

My colleague the Minister of Culture and Communications has announced \$15.4 million for renewal of the Ontario film investment program and other film initiatives in 1991-92. In addition, this budget provides a further \$7.5 million to the Ontario Arts Council for the support of artists and arts organizations, and an additional \$5.4 million for a publishing strategy and support for community radio, which will particularly benefit aboriginal peoples and francophones. The minister will be providing further details.

Many northern communities, particularly single-industry towns, are under extreme pressure from long-term structural challenges. The north has the highest unemployment rate of any region in the province. In recognition of the difficult economic conditions in the north, 30% of the anti-recession program has been allocated to northern Ontario. We have also responded to the special needs of northern communities by supporting local diversification initiatives, relocating provincial jobs and giving priority consideration under existing provincial programs to local projects.

The government recognizes the importance of the mining industry to the future prosperity of the north. We anticipate the signing of a new \$30-million, five-year, federal-provincial minerals development agreement to enhance mining development and research.

A long-standing source of concern in the north is the high price of gasoline. There is a significant differential between gasoline prices in northern and southern Ontario. Delivery costs are higher to the north and the northern market is not as competitive, due in part to lower population densities and fewer gasoline stations. In recognition of this differential, the motor vehicle registration fee for residents of northern Ontario will be eliminated effective 1 May 1991. This will save northern motorists \$15 million this year.

Residents of northern Ontario often have to travel a considerable distance to receive medical treatment or to see a specialist. The Ontario government will provide \$3.4 million over current spending to improve the northern health travel grant program. The government is reducing the minimum distance to 100 kilometres from 250 kilometres for travel within northern Ontario or to Manitoba. In addition, the travel grant program will now include the district of Parry Sound and all of the district of Nipissing.

This government believes that all our citizens must share in the benefits of economic growth and social progress. The investment that we as taxpayers make in social equity contributes to a healthy society and a strong economy. In this budget, we are starting to reduce social deficits caused by inequity, poverty and lack of access in our society. There is a real connection between our social infrastructure and our economy. Our social programs help give people the confidence to meet the challenge of economic change and participate fully in our economy.

The social assistance system is an essential part of this province's social safety net. Tens of thousands of people who have lost their jobs in the past year are relying on social assistance for the basics of life: food and shelter. This system is of vital support to the stability and security of our economy. It is also an investment in Ontario's future—approximately 40% of those who depend on social assistance are children.

We will commit \$215 million on a full-year basis to reform of the social assistance system.

Reform of the system has been a major issue since the Transitions report of the Social Assistance Review Committee was released in 1988. The Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation, an independent working group reporting to the Minister of Community and Social Services, said in its recent report, *Back on Track*, that the momentum for reform had been lost since initial changes to the system were made in 1989.

This government is committed to putting the reform process back on track. This \$215 million reform package, which will be described in more detail by the minister, is designed to provide benefits for those who are in greatest need, to help people get into the labour force, to increase fairness and accessibility and to assist municipalities with their funding responsibilities.

This is a major commitment, particularly in a year in which social assistance costs are expected to reach \$4.9 billion, up from \$2.5 billion just two years ago.

This government is committed to greater equity in the tax system. To provide advice on how to make the system fairer, we have established the Fair Tax Commission. This is the first major review of Ontario's tax system in 25 years. As members are aware, the commission will be examining a number of specific tax issues that are high on the government's agenda. Two issues in particular require immediate attention.

I have asked the commission to accelerate its consultations on a corporate minimum tax for Ontario. I realize that this is a complex subject; however, it is my intention to move in this area to ensure that corporations reporting profits but paying little or no income tax pay their fair share.

I have also asked for early advice on an Ontario land speculation tax. I believe that appropriate action should be taken soon before speculation can again become a problem in a recovering housing market.

But the work of making our tax system fairer has already started. Today I am announcing the largest enrichment in the history of the Ontario tax reduction program. This program benefits people at the low end of the income

scale. Effective for the 1991 tax year, the \$200 supplements now provided for each dependent child or dependant with a disability will be raised to \$350. This means that a single parent with two dependent children and who is earning \$22,500 will no longer pay any Ontario personal income tax.

This \$50 million tax cut brings to 700,000 the number of low-income taxpayers whose Ontario income tax will now be reduced or eliminated for the 1991 tax year.

In addition, I am proposing an increase in the personal income surtax rate. This is intended to make the tax system more progressive by ensuring that those at the upper end of the income scale pay a greater share. Effective 1 July 1991, the surtax rate will increase from 10% to 14% of Ontario income tax in excess of \$10,000. The surtax only affects taxpayers with incomes of \$84,000 or higher. This action will add \$60 million to revenues in 1991-92.

Affordable housing is a key priority of this government. Housing is the main non-discretionary expense for families on low and moderate incomes. We are committed to increasing the supply of affordable housing to respond to the need and to contribute to the vitality of our communities.

The government intends to go forward with an unprecedented level of provincially supported housing activity in this fiscal year. By refining programs, speeding up approvals and reallocating units, we will have close to 35,000 units of co-operative and non-profit housing under development. We expect people will be moving into about 13,000 of these units this year. This activity will inject some \$1.3 billion into the construction industry in 1991-92, with associated employment of about 20,000 jobs.

In addition, we are announcing the provision of another 10,000 non-profit units, which will cost the province approximately \$150 million in annual operating subsidies when completed. My colleague the Minister of Housing will be announcing further details. For 1991-92 the Ministry of Housing will be allocated more than \$764 million to meet its operating expenditures, representing an increase of more than 39% in its funding.

1640

For many women, home is not a safe haven. We are committing an additional \$12 million for new beds and enhanced services in emergency shelters and other improvements to services for women who are victims of domestic violence.

Violence against women is a major social problem which we must work resolutely to eliminate. In this budget, the government significantly expands its commitment to address the issues of wife assault and sexual assault. Funding for these two programs will increase by more than 33% over last year.

Additional funds to eliminate wife assault will focus not only on emergency shelters for women and their children, but on counselling and prevention programs, services for racial minorities and women with disabilities and on development of local responses to aboriginal family violence.

Increased expenditures of more than \$8 million will significantly expand and enhance services to women and children who are victims of sexual assault. This new funding

will extend services for rural, francophone, disabled, immigrant and racial minority women.

We cannot have an economy which flourishes at the expense of certain parts of the workforce. It is unfair and unacceptable to undervalue certain occupations and sectors based on systemic discrimination. The Minister of Labour has announced amendments to the Pay Equity Act which will allow an additional 420,000 women to benefit from pay equity.

This government will make available \$100 million to assist our major transfer partners, including municipalities, school boards, hospitals and universities and colleges, with the cost of pay equity adjustments due in 1991-92. This funding is above and beyond what is normally provided for day-to-day operations. A further \$25 million will be provided in 1991-92 to assist other transfer agencies in meeting their pay equity obligations. In addition to the \$125 million, the Minister of Community and Social Services previously announced an initial step towards pay equity for child care workers by providing \$30 million to improve salaries.

The government's financial commitment to pay equity is not limited to this fiscal year. We will contribute almost \$1 billion annually at maturity towards pay equity adjustments in the broad public sector.

Employment equity involves a comprehensive process to ensure equitable representation and to reduce systemic barriers to the recruitment, retention and promotion of underrepresented groups of people. The groups designated in the Ontario public service program are aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities, francophones, racial minorities and women. These groups represent 60% of Ontario's population and more than half the labour force. We must make the most of the potential of all our citizens to help us meet social and economic challenges.

This government intends to be a model employer and to lead both the broad public sector and the private sector in achieving employment equity. We have committed \$24 million in 1991-92 to employment equity initiatives in the Ontario public service. This is more than double previous funding levels. The government has also appointed a commissioner to conduct consultations on proposed employment equity legislation.

The government of Ontario is taking tangible steps towards equity for aboriginal peoples. We will commit more than \$48 million in 1991-92 towards an improved quality of life that is long overdue for the aboriginal peoples of this land. Part of this funding will be used to help lay the groundwork for self-government and resolution of long-standing land claims through support for research and negotiations.

Also included in this year's funding are \$20 million in expenditures on community infrastructure to improve living conditions in aboriginal communities through support for water and sewer systems, housing and electrical power. Social service improvements for first nations communities will include \$5 million in capital funding this year to create 400 new spaces for child care on reserves. Other funding for aboriginal peoples will be used for economic development programs and education initiatives at all levels.

First nations will also benefit from funds allocated for social assistance reform which will respond to the proposals put forward by these communities.

The government is acutely aware that we are responsible for the effective fiscal management of the broad Ontario public sector. We must ensure that the people of Ontario are getting the highest-quality services for their tax dollars. This government is convinced that the only way we will achieve effective fiscal management is through a comprehensive review and evaluation of existing programs with the participation of the people who use the services and the people who provide them. We must respond to the social and economic needs of this province by making what the public sector does and how it does it more efficient and more effective.

I indicated at the outset of this statement that we have made a concerted effort in this budget to ensure that the government does what it can to fight the recession and to prepare the economy for recovery. As the economy recovers, however, I believe it is essential to reduce the deficit significantly. Today I am putting forward a three-year fiscal plan that shows the consolidated deficit declining from \$9.7 billion this year to \$7.8 billion in 1994-95.

The clear fiscal targets set out in this plan are expected to reduce the deficit as a proportion of gross domestic product and total revenue. We anticipate that by 1995 the deficit will fall from 3.4% to 2.2% of gross domestic product and from 22.6% to 13.7% of revenue.

Our fiscal plan is also intended to stabilize the important debt-servicing portion of our budget. As total debt rises, our fiscal plan shows servicing costs moving from 11.6 cents per revenue dollar to a steady 12.3 cents. Contrast this with the situation of the federal government, where about 34 cents of every revenue dollar now go to service the national debt. This government will not let Ontario slip into that kind of fiscal trap.

The deficit is not an issue that is simply of concern to the bond markets and rating agencies. It is a concern of ordinary working people in Ontario, because they do not want an ever-increasing share of their hard-earned tax dollars going to pay the interest on a huge public debt. By 1994-95 we plan to bring the operating portion of the deficit down from \$5.4 billion to \$3 billion. Looking beyond the medium-term forecast, we plan to eliminate the operating deficit within a further three years. After the last recession it took from 1982 to 1987 to balance the operating budget during a period of strong and rapid growth. Although the outlook for economic growth is more modest in the years ahead, we still expect to meet our objectives of balancing the operating budget by 1997.

The task ahead would be much simpler if the federal government had not begun a deliberate campaign in the 1980s to dismantle its commitments to social programs. These cumulative federal reductions in the established programs financing and payments under the Canada assistance plan will cost Ontario some \$3.6 billion in 1991-92 alone, enough to wipe out almost two thirds of our operating deficit. What is more, the federal government has announced its intentions to continue to restrict its contribution to essential social programs for a further three

years, with serious consequences for the wellbeing of our nation.

The fiscal plan will not be easy to implement, but it is realistic. I want to emphasize that it will allow the government to move forward with its priorities.

The budget control system we inherited from previous administrations simply cannot do the job in the circumstances we face. We found there was no effective mechanism for examining the structure of entire programs. We are therefore establishing a Treasury Board, which I will chair, with clear responsibility for expenditure management. Critical to its functioning will be the development of budget planning that looks beyond a single year and the introduction of an expenditure review and evaluation process that integrates the policy priorities of the government into allocation decisions.

1650

The task of evaluating programs and reallocating government spending will entail redesigning programs and taking new approaches to service delivery. For example, my colleague the Minister of Education has been reviewing the planning for educational facilities as part of a change in direction towards community-based multi-use schools. The \$300 million in school capital funding that I am announcing today for 1994-95 will incorporate this new approach.

We will also be asking the people who work in the public service to help us meet the targets of our fiscal plan. Working in partnership, we will find the best ways to make services more responsive to needs and to reduce costs.

We have not followed the lead of some other governments which have reduced public service jobs at a time of high unemployment and have imposed arbitrary wage limits. Instead, we intend to work co-operatively with the public service unions to meet our targets in ways that support new workplace co-operation and innovation.

It is important that we look for new ways to involve members of the Legislature and the general public, as well as our employees, in contributing to the solutions needed to address these challenges. The province funds a range of services, like health care, education and many social services, which are basic to our way of life. It is important that the public, which uses these services and pays for them through their taxes, participates in the process of identifying where we can improve effectiveness.

We are committed to major changes in the budget process in this province. Bringing the process into the 1990s is a major challenge and, given its scale, I fully expect changes to continue throughout the mandate of this government. As a first step, I intend to ask for the views of the standing committee on finance and economic affairs on ways to open up the budget process to involve more public participation.

One of the most crucial areas requiring effective management is our health care system. This is a priority for two major reasons: because publicly funded health care is so essential to our way of life, and because the costs of our health care system are threatening to overwhelm all other government expenditures.

We must maintain the quality of health services while reducing the rate of expenditure growth in the system. Health care costs currently account for approximately one third of total provincial spending. Health expenditures have increased by an average of more than 12% per year for the past 10 years.

This government is committed to managing health care expenditures more effectively while maintaining or improving standards of care and upholding the principles of medicare, including universality and accessibility. We believe the best way to accomplish this is in partnership with health care providers. We are therefore encouraged by the tentative agreement that has been reached through negotiations with the Ontario Medical Association.

If this landmark agreement is ratified by members of the OMA next month, we will be embarking on a new era in our health care system. It will involve a constructive and co-operative relationship between the government and the Ontario Medical Association. It will introduce a management system that emphasizes quality and cost-effectiveness. This system will manage payments to physicians and will not limit patient access to health services. It will allow us to plan better for the future and to allocate resources where they are most needed.

I cannot prejudge the results of the upcoming ratification vote. I can only say that the government hopes to join with physicians in managing our quality health care system in the interests of all the people of Ontario.

The Minister of Health will be providing further information to members of the House once the ratification vote has been held.

Today I can inform the House of two aspects of the government's overall strategy to manage our health care system more effectively. These are not part of the tentative agreement. They affect out-of-country health services and the Ontario drug benefit plan.

OHIP payments for out-of-country health services, primarily in the United States, have increased dramatically from \$100 million in 1988-89 to \$225 million in 1990-91, a 125% increase in only three years. The province is enacting a series of modifications to the current OHIP policy to ensure that payments for out-of-country health services reflect the cost of services in Ontario. We will also establish service registries and information systems to identify available services within the province so that fewer people will have to use outside services.

Measures to manage the Ontario drug benefit plan more effectively are being pursued as well. Expenditures in this area have increased by an average of 19% over the past 10 years. The government intends to implement tighter controls on reimbursement for drugs, establish more comprehensive guidelines for prescribing drugs and require more objective evaluations in order for a new drug to gain coverage.

The Minister of Health will be announcing details of these measures soon. These actions are part of our continuing efforts to manage our \$17-billion health care system better.

Capital expenditures represent another important area where improved public sector fiscal management is

needed. Governments often reduce capital spending as a short-term restraint measure. Such cuts are at the expense of our capacity to respond to, and lead, social and economic change.

In order to recognize the importance of capital and to focus on the strategic planning of capital expenditures, Ontario is establishing a capital fund and an operating fund. Starting in the 1991-92 fiscal year, there will be separate budgets for capital and operating expenditures. We will continue to show the consolidated deficit or surplus position of the province.

Tax policy has a critical role to play in effective fiscal management. Central to the role of tax policy is ensuring that tax expenditures are cost-effective. The Fair Tax Commission has a major responsibility to provide advice in this area.

In this budget, I am proceeding with three measures that will tighten up the tax base and contribute to better tax expenditure management.

First, I am announcing the capping of the three-year mining tax exemption to target the incentive more effectively. The exemption will be limited to the first \$10 million of profits from qualifying mines earned from 30 April 1991.

Second, because of its structure, the small business deduction in Ontario's corporate income tax system is currently available to corporations regardless of their size or profitability. I will therefore be introducing measures, to be effective 1 January 1992, to focus the benefits on small Canadian-controlled private corporations.

Third, the Ontario motorist protection plan, introduced by the previous government, created an inequity by exempting insurance companies from the tax on certain auto insurance premiums. As of midnight tonight, this inequity will be removed by eliminating the exemption.

Together, these tax changes will generate \$70 million this fiscal year.

I am also concerned about the potential for non-resident companies to shift income outside the country. Income earned in Canada should be subject to Canadian income tax. I have asked the federal Minister of Finance to examine, in consultation with the provinces, the rules regarding thin capitalization and transfer pricing.

Responsible management also requires some changes to tax rates.

First, the capital tax on banks and loan and trust companies will increase from 0.8% to 1%, effective midnight tonight. This is still the lowest provincial rate on banks and loan and trust companies in the country.

Second, as of midnight tonight the tax per cigarette will be increased by 1.67 cents to 6.5 cents, with an equivalent increase on cut tobacco. It has been estimated that each year tobacco-induced diseases cause 13,000 premature deaths in Ontario. My colleague the Minister of Health will be announcing details of the provincial tobacco control strategy. This tobacco tax increase will play a key role in this strategy, particularly in discouraging young people from smoking. It is expected that this tax increase, when combined with the federal three-cent increase, will

result in a decline of tobacco consumption by Ontario smokers of close to 15%.

Finally, levies on all alcohol products will increase by five cents per litre effective 27 May 1991.

The total revenue impact of these tax rate changes is estimated at \$280 million this fiscal year.

1700

This budget sets out our vision of the future of this province. I want to add a few words about our vision of the future of this country.

As the Premier has said many times, we have a long history together as Canadians, a history that binds us in many real and intangible ways. Today, every province in Canada is facing serious economic and social challenges. We are stronger if we face them together.

Our vision of sustainable prosperity for Ontario embraces a renewed and revitalized Confederation. We believe there is an important role for national leadership to secure the Canadian economic union.

Nous devons parvenir à un consensus pour l'avenir du pays. Le Canada doit pouvoir oeuvrer dans l'intérêt de toutes les parties du pays et de tous les segments de la société. L'Ontario est prêt à jouer un rôle constructif et positif dans cette entreprise.

We must find a new consensus for the future. Canada must be made to work in the interests of all parts of the country and all parts of society. Ontario is prepared to play a constructive and positive role in this endeavour.

The budget I am tabling in the Legislature this afternoon is one which puts a strategic focus on sustainable prosperity and fairness.

This budget contributes to recovery at a time of serious recession. We will not cut back on the delivery of basic services to the people of Ontario when so many families are hurting.

We are creating some 70,000 jobs through our investment in the economy. We are helping unemployed workers re-enter the workforce. We are expanding our commitments to technology and innovation with renewed emphasis on training.

We are providing tax relief for the working poor. We are making a substantial commitment to reforming our social assistance system. We are significantly expanding government commitments to affordable housing. We are making a major contribution to a healthy environment.

We are providing assistance for farmers. We are addressing the special needs of aboriginal peoples and the north. We are improving and expanding pay equity for women and employment equity initiatives.

We are committed to managing the deficit through effective fiscal management based on an open process that involves participation by the people who use public services and those who provide them.

We are putting forward a multi-year fiscal plan. We are proposing a new management system in health care, in partnership with health care providers.

We are committed to developing other partnerships with labour, business and communities so that we may work together to meet the challenges of social and economic change.

We made a choice in this budget to fight the recession, not this year's deficit, because we believe that is the priority for the people of Ontario. We will not sacrifice the essential services that Ontarians need. We are dedicated to maintaining quality health care and education. We will invest in the future and in jobs to help strengthen our province. We are laying the foundation for a sound recovery and working towards a more productive, equitable and sustainable economy.

Mr Bradley: I move the adjournment of the debate.

The Speaker: The member for St Catharines moves the adjournment of the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry? No?

Hon Miss Martel: If I might, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to revert to introduction of bills.

The Speaker: We really should adjourn the debate first before any other procedure, so I would like to call that again.

On motion by Mr Bradley, the debate was adjourned.

Hon Miss Martel: I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to revert to introduction of bills.

Agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

ONTARIO LOAN ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR LES EMPRUNTS DE L'ONTARIO

Mr Laughren has moved first reading of Bill 81, An Act to authorize borrowing on the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

M. Laughren propose la première lecture du projet de loi 81, Loi autorisant les emprunts garantis par le Trésor.

1711

The House divided on Mr Laughren's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Laughren, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-71

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, Mackenzie, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays/Contre-47

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Cleary, Conway, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jackson, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, Mc-

Guinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, Offer, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ramsay, Ruprecht, Scott, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

TREASURY BOARD ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 SUR LE CONSEIL DU TRÉSOR

Mr Laughren moved first reading of Bill 82, An Act to establish the Treasury Board.

M. Laughren propose la première lecture du projet de loi 82, Loi créant le Conseil du Trésor.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI DE L'IMPÔT SUR LE REVENU

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 83, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

M^{me} Wark-Martyn propose la première lecture du projet de loi 83, Loi portant modification de la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu.

1720

The House divided on Ms Wark-Martyn's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M^{me} Wark-Martyn, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-71

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessenger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays/Contre-45

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Cleary, Conway, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Elston, Eves, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jackson, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ruprecht, Scott, Sola, Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

TOBACCO TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI DE LA TAXE SUR LE TABAC

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 84, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

M^{me} Wark-Martyn propose la première lecture du projet de loi 84, Loi portant modification de la Loi de la taxe sur le tabac.

1735

The House divided on Ms Wark-Martyn's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M^{me} Wark-Martyn, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-70

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays/Contre-43

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Carr, Chiarelli, Cleary, Conway, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neill, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ruprecht, Scott, Sola, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J.

FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

**LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI
DE LA TAXE SUR LES CARBURANTS**

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 85, An Act to amend the Fuel Tax Act, 1981.

M^{me} Wark-Martyn propose la première lecture du projet de loi 85, Loi portant modification de la Loi de 1981 de la taxe sur les carburants.

1745

The House divided on Ms Wark-Martyn's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M^{me} Wark-Martyn, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-71

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S.,

North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays/Contre-43

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Conway, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neill, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Ruprecht, Scott, Sola, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

GASOLINE TAX AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

**LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI
DE LA TAXE SUR L'ESSENCE**

Ms Wark-Martyn moved first reading of Bill 86, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.

M^{me} Wark-Martyn propose la première lecture du projet de loi 86, Loi portant modification de la Loi de la taxe sur l'essence.

1757

The House divided on Ms Wark-Martyn's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M^{me} Wark-Martyn, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-72

Abel, Akande, Allen, Bisson, Boyd, Buchanan, Carter, Charlton, Christopherson, Churley, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Drainville, Duignan, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Marchese, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Pilkey, Pouliot, Rae, Rizzo, Silipo, Sutherland, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Winninger, Wiseman, Wood, Ziemba.

Nays/Contre-42

Arnott, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Carr, Chiarelli, Conway, Cousens, Cunningham, Curling, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Fawcett, Grandmaître, Harnick, Harris, Jordan, Kwinter, Mahoney, Marland, McGuinty, McLeod, Miclash, Morin, Murdoch, B., Nixon, O'Neill, H., O'Neill, Y., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Scott, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

The House adjourned at 1802.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathyssen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward

Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson

Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood

Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 29 April 1991

Members' statements

School transfer	1035
Mr Mancini	
Ontario road map	1035
Mr B. Murdoch	
Stratford Shakespearean Festival	1035
Mrs Haslam	
Earth Week project	1035
Mrs Caplan	
Termination agreement	1036
Mr Jordan	
Events in Brantford	1036
Mr B. Ward	
Youth employment	1036
Mr Phillips	
Hunting in Algonquin Park	1036
Mr J. Wilson	
High school capacity	1036
Mr Morrow	

Statement by the ministry

Ministerial responsibility	1037
Mr Hampton	

Responses

Ministerial responsibility	1037
Mr Nixon	
Mr Harnick	

Oral questions

Ministerial responsibility	1039
Mr Nixon	
Mr Hampton	
Mr Scott	
Mr Harnick	
Mr Sterling	
Mr Sorbara	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Harnick	
Mr Hampton	
Apprenticeship training	1042
Mr Mills	
Mr Allen	
Ministerial responsibility	1043
Mr Elston	
Mr Hampton	
Mr Harnick	
Driver examinations for seniors	1044
Mr Hansen	
Mr Philip	

Ministerial responsibility	1044
Mr Nixon	
Mr Hampton	
Mr Harnick	
Mr Farnan	
Waste management	1045
Ms M. Ward	
Mrs Grier	
Ministerial responsibility	1045
Mr Curling	
Mr Farnan	
Mr Harnick	
Mr Hampton	
Pesticides	1046
Mrs Haslam	
Mr Buchanan	

Petition

Automobile insurance	1046
Mr Mills	

First readings

Government Spending Control Act, 1991, Bill 80	1046
Mr Stockwell	
Agreed to	1046
Ontario Loan Act, 1991, Bill 81	1055
Mr Laughren	
Agreed to	1055
Treasury Board Act, 1991, Bill 82	1055
Mr Laughren	
Agreed to	1055
Income Tax Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 83	1055
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	1055
Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 84	1055
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	1056
Fuel Tax Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 85	1056
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	1056
Gasoline Tax Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 86	1056
Ms Wark-Martyn	
Agreed to	1056

Other business

Visitor	1046
The Speaker	
Question period	1046
Mr Sorbara	
Business of the House	1046
Miss Martel	

Budget speech	1046	Lists of members	
Mr Laughren			
Adjournment	1056	Members and their responsibilities	1057
		Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1060

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 29 avril 1991

Première lecture			
Loi de 1991 contrôle des dépenses publiques,		Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi de l'impôt sur le revenu,	
projet de loi 80	1046	proje de loi 83	1055
M. Stockwell		Mme Wark-Martyn	
Adoptée	1046	Adoptée	1055
Loi de 1991 sur les emprunts de l'Ontario,		Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi de la taxe sur le tabac,	
projet de loi 81	1055	projet de loi 84	1055
M. Laughren		Mme Wark-Martyn	
Adoptée	1055	Adoptée	1056
Loi de 1991 sur le conseil du Trésor,		Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi de la taxe sur les carburant,	
projet de loi 82	1055	projet de loi 85	1056
M. Laughren		Mme Wark-Martyn	
Adoptée	1055	Adoptée	1056
		Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi de la taxe sur l'essence,	
		projet de loi 86	1056
		Mme Wark-Martyn	
		Adoptée	1056



25 1991

25 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 30 April 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 30 avril 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 30 April 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr Brown: It is springtime on Manitoulin. The ice has moved out of the bays, the grass is turning green, the smelt are running, the splake are biting, the golf courses are open, and in Gore Bay the garbage is beginning to stink.

The townships of Gordon, Barrie Island, Burpee and Mills and the town of Gore Bay have not had a dump since 1 January. The municipalities have gone the master plan route. They are no closer today to a permanent solution than they were three years ago. The process does not work. It is overly bureaucratic, it often defies common sense, it pits neighbour against neighbour, it is not environmentally sound and, most important, it does not give you a landfill site.

My constituents are becoming expert at reducing, at reusing, at recycling, even at composting, yet there is still garbage. Unfortunately, they are also becoming expert at burning it in their backyards. Surely the Minister of the Environment will replace her rhetoric with action in the real world.

The mayor of Gore Bay, like the mayor of Kirkland Lake, cannot meet with the minister. She tells him to talk to her officials. The time to change the system is now. My constituents need a landfill. The weather is starting to warm up and the garbage is starting to smell.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mrs Cunningham: My statement today is directed towards the Minister of Colleges and Universities. In May 1990, the universities were invited to submit proposals for program adjustment grants. Universities, in good faith, submitted projects to support government initiatives in technological studies, health promotion and nutrition and an off-campus, part-time bachelor of science in nursing program, to name only a few.

Procedures were worked out at considerable pain and length with the ministry, the Ontario Council on University Affairs and the Council of Ontario Universities. However, I say to the minister, these procedures were not followed.

In a recent memorandum from the Council of Ontario Universities, the minister's decisions were described as "ill informed, arbitrary and without foundation." They disregard the allocative procedures which were agreed to by the Council of Ontario Universities, the Ontario Council on University Affairs and the government. A new government may have new priorities, but I am concerned that the minister did not consult with the universities.

We are interested in learning the criteria the minister used to explain why certain projects were funded and others were not. If he is truly taking the advice of his advisers,

why did he change the procedure without consulting them? He asked for advice and he ignored it. The university community, including students, is losing confidence in a government that promised to be better.

JOHN EAKINS

Mr Drainville: When speaking with the dining room and security staff just after I arrived, I would introduce myself as the new member for Victoria-Haliburton. Many people expressed how kind and considerate John Eakins, my predecessor, had been to them. John Eakins, who sat in this House from 1975 until 1990, always seemed to have a good word to say about someone or something. He is described as a truly gentle man.

On Friday 26 April, John Eakins was recognized by people of all political persuasions at a retirement dinner held in his honour in Lindsay. In the 1960s, John became a councillor in Lindsay. He then became the mayor of Victoria-Haliburton's largest town. After two unsuccessful attempts, John Eakins became the MPP for that riding in 1975. During his time at the Legislature, John not only represented his constituents but also was Minister of Tourism and Minister of Municipal Affairs.

The retirement dinner acknowledged almost 30 years of public service. John said he is "just a poor pensioner on a fixed income now," but I and many others know that John Eakins continues to serve the community whenever asked.

I would ask the members of the House to join me in congratulating John Eakins on almost three decades of public service and to wish him well in his new life.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Mrs Sullivan: The Minister of the Environment said just three days ago that the main reason her party formed this government was because of the high priority it gave to environmental matters. The minister must be acutely embarrassed as her government's real commitment to the environment is exposed. I could not help but note that actions speak louder than words.

In the budget yesterday, we saw that funding for the environment had increased at a level that is just slightly above inflation. Following Liberal budget increases of 22% last year and 19% the year before, the NDP commitment of a 7.8% increase is nothing short of paltry. Not only has the rate of increase in allocations for the environment dropped by two thirds; the total share of the budget for the environment has dropped.

This must be a surprise to the voters of Ontario who listened to the minister and to the Premier about the new environmental age in the province. There is no new money for clean air or clean water. In fact, there is very little new money for anything. Again we see the minister unable to move much beyond garbage.

People in Ontario believe that environmental protection must be increased. People in Ontario believed the

NDP would do this. There are a lot of disappointed people in the wake of the Minister of the Environment's failure to secure the necessary resources and to meet the promises.

1340

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr Stockwell: Yesterday the Treasurer announced the establishment of a Treasury Board to help control government spending. It seems to me, looking at yesterday's budget, that it is a bit like announcing that you are creating a fire department after you have burned down your house. Not only is the creation of a Treasury Board an admission that Management Board and the Management Board chairman have been asleep at the switch, but it is also an exercise in futility.

The budget shows that the Treasury Board is doomed to failure. Between now and 1994-95, this government plans to spend a total of \$234 billion, and by 1994-95 will be spending at a rate of nearly \$65 billion annually. The NDP definition of spending control is clearly much different than ours. If the Treasurer was genuinely interested in controlling government spending, he would have acted on some of the recommendations put forward by this party. He would have controlled civil service growth, he would have capped pay increases in the public sector, he would have frozen taxes. He would have in fact done some of the things which every other Treasurer in this country has done to control the cost and the size of government.

So I say to the Treasurer that listening to him talk about spending restraint is a lot like listening to a Liberal talk about holding the line on taxes. It is amusing, but it sure ain't credible.

VOLUNTEERS

Mr Martin: Today I would like to congratulate certain members of my constituency who will be receiving Volunteer Service Awards from both the Ministry of Culture and Communications and the Ministry of Citizenship. These volunteers must be commended for their excellence and continuing efforts to commit of themselves and of their time to the people and the city of Sault Ste Marie. As we are experiencing difficult times across the province, it is essential for a community to pull together, particularly as volunteers.

Therefore, I would like to sincerely thank and recognize the outstanding work of the following individuals: Irene Bolduc, Mr Boschetto, Helmut Brandstetter, Lido Christian, Tara Coulterman, Harold Crowder, Mrs Facey, Francis Fata, Michel Faucon, Barbara Fiacconi, Edna Fisher, Vardys Fleming, John Fleming, Carol Gartshore, Maria Georgas, Madge Grosjean, Paula Harrison, Tom Hendrie, Harry Houston, Maria Karadimos, Jean King, Mr Klemm, Katie Kopec, Alberto Leva, Opal Litalien, Sandy Maggetti, Patricia Maninos, Anna Nardini, Paul Nykanen, Velma O'Hara, George Papadogianis, Mr Peristeridis, Marie Pettalia, Rosemary Pritchard, Anneliese Rausch, Lorenzo Romani, Carol Rowland, Perry Short, Leonard Stortini, Marie-Reine Taillefer, Irene Thibert, Gunther Thom, Ann Tonkin, Nancy Wagner, Joan Walamaki, David Walsh, Mike Yannelis and Ruth Zaffini.

NURSING HOMES

Mr McGuinty: I wish to make a special plea on behalf of St Patrick's Home of Ottawa, a charitable home located in my riding. My plea is directed to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

St Patrick's has a long and venerable history in Ottawa, where it first began accepting residents in 1866. As a charitable home, St Patrick's receives significantly less assistance from the ministry than do municipal homes, although it provides the same quality of service. This inequity in our system of funding charitable homes was addressed in *Strategies for Change: A Study of Long Term Care for the Aging*, a report commissioned by the previous government. This report makes specific recommendations which the minister has yet to act on.

The board of directors for St Patrick's recently drafted a proposed budget for the fiscal year ending 31 March 1992. The projected spending deficit exceeds \$1 million. Approximately \$850,000 of this amount is due solely to extended care obligations assumed by the home.

Last year, the Ministry of Community and Social Services commissioned Touche Ross to review operating expenses at St Pat's. This study concluded that the home has operated efficiently and economically.

The only means of redress available to the home lies with the minister. In the short term, the minister must assist St Pat's with a special grant to enable it to meet its obligations for this fiscal year. In the long term, the minister must assist St Pat's and other charitable homes by introducing legislation in this House which will address the existing inequities in the funding of charitable homes.

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Jordan: It was announced yesterday that Denison Mines is shutting its uranium mine in Elliot Lake. This devastating blow to northern Ontario will put about 1,100 people out of work. The unemployment rate there now is over 60% and will now go to over 80%. Prior to the election, the current Premier of this province told the people his government would increase, not decrease, the purchase of uranium from Denison Mines. This promise has obviously been broken, as the Minister of Energy in conjunction with Ontario Hydro have broken their contract to buy uranium from Denison Mines.

The monetary cost to the people of Ontario is not clear at this time. The government's failure to honour its election commitments shows it was more interested in making irresponsible promises to secure votes than in developing responsible policies to secure the future of 1,100 employees. How can the members of this government face the people of Elliot Lake when prior to the election they filled them with these false hopes? Now the government is putting the final nail in the coffin of Elliot Lake.

RAYMOND KANE

Mr Abel: It is with great pleasure that I stand in the House today and pay tribute to a Wentworth North constituent, Raymond Kane of Dundas. On Wednesday 24 April Ray was chosen Dundas Citizen of the Year, an award he well deserves.

As a resident of Dundas for 35 years, Ray has served nine of those years as a member of St Joseph's Villa board of trustees where he is now completing the second year as chairman. Ray has contributed a significant amount of volunteer time for the development and future direction of St. Joseph's Villa as well as negotiating with the provincial government to secure a dependable service to the seniors in his surrounding community. During Ray's service at St Joseph's Villa, I had the opportunity to collaborate with him on some funding concerns for the villa and during that time he has proven to be a dedicated and tireless individual.

In addition, Ray served 14 years as a member of the Dundas Public Library and two years as chairman, and four years as a member of the Dundas Community Development Council and one year as vice-chairman. During that time he has proven strong leadership while on the building committee of St Augustine's church.

In closing I ask the House today to join me in congratulating Raymond Kane for his contribution of time, service and dedication to the community. We are all very proud to have Ray in our community.

VISITOR

Mr Malkowski: I would like to introduce a very distinguished visitor who is here visiting with us from Italy and his name is Sciarra Donato, and his wife, who are sitting here in the gallery. They are here visiting their brother. He is the president of the Abruzzi Region of the Deaf as well as deputy to the Italian National Association of the Deaf and he works as an assistant to the chief of the regional government in Abruzzi, Italy. I would like him to stand please and be recognized.

ORAL QUESTIONS

BUDGET

Mr Bradley: I have a question for the Treasurer. That would be no surprise, probably, to anybody. In light of the loss of confidence in the Ontario economy brought on by this Treasurer's budget, which includes a \$10-billion deficit and his projection that the provincial debt will nearly double in the four years of the Bob Rae government; in light of the effect that massive borrowing by the Rae government will have on interest rates; in light of the fact that the Treasurer raised taxes by \$1 billion in the first full year his budget takes effect; in light of the fact that he projects that he will further increase tax revenues every year by some 9.8% for the next four years; and in light of the Treasurer's renewed commitment of yesterday to increase corporate taxes, could the Treasurer inform the House why any employer in this province would not pack up and head to some other jurisdiction. Could he inform the House why anyone looking at these statistics, this budget and these circumstances, would invest in the province of Ontario. In other words, why would he bring forward a budget of this kind, which would discourage people from staying in Ontario and discourage people from investing in the future?

1350

Hon Mr Laughren: I thank the member for St Catharines for the question. It was not unanticipated. I think

there are a few assumptions built into the member's questions that are totally wrong, absolutely wrong. I regret very much that he, as a member of this assembly, does not have the confidence in the Ontario economy that those of us on this side do; I can tell him that much.

Mr Stockwell: They are excited about this, Floyd. They are standing in line to congratulate you.

The Speaker: The member for Etobicoke West will have an opportunity later for questions.

Hon Mr Laughren: I have absolutely no doubt whatsoever that Ontario is the best place of any jurisdiction for any business operation to locate. I have no hesitation in saying that. We have, in this province, a very sound infrastructure. We have a well-trained, well-motivated workforce. We have a health care system that is second to none anywhere. It seems to me that when the business community is looking for a place to invest, it will indeed continue to look at Ontario.

Mr Bradley: The lack of confidence, as the Treasurer would know, is not in the province of Ontario; it is in the government of Ontario at the present time. I think the Treasurer will agree that I am always fairminded when I direct questions to him. Any fairminded individual in the province of Ontario would conclude that in a deep recession of the kind that we have at the present time, it would be necessary to incur a deficit in order to deal with that recession—at least, that is one of the many tools that might be employed in that regard. While that is the case, many financial observers, including the Dominion Bond Rating Service in Canada and Salomon Brothers in the United States have expressed grave concern about the enormous size of the NDP deficit for this year and subsequent years. It is a fact, because of course it was on the CBC at noon, so it must be true.

Would the Treasurer not agree that a \$10-billion deficit will send the wrong kind of signals to the international business community, and may result in taxpayers paying even greater rates of interest on a provincial debt that is projected to grow by leaps and bounds under an NDP government.

Hon Mr Laughren: The member is quite right. He is, generally speaking, very fairminded, and I appreciate having a critic who fits that mould normally. He is quite correct that the Dominion Bond Rating Service has put Ontario on credit watch. When it saw a deficit go from \$3 billion to \$9.7 billion with this budget, I can understand why it would do that. If I was running a credit agency, I would too. I trust that the bond rating agencies, which we will be meeting with in the next couple of weeks—which is traditional in the province following a budget anyway—when they have an opportunity to meet with us and to examine the components of that \$9.7-billion deficit, will understand, perhaps as members opposite do not, that what we did in the province of Ontario was decide that this was going to be a short-term recession and that we wanted to be well placed when the recovery begins later this year. We have not done what other jurisdictions have done and pulled the plug on major services such as health care and education, because we believe they must be maintained.

I understand why the member opposite believes that we should have slashed spending and programs. Perhaps he believes that in his heart of hearts. He did not seem to when they were in government just a short time ago but, nevertheless, I disagree with the member completely, entirely. I believe that we must maintain those programs. I think they are absolutely critical and I guess where I really part company with the member is that I believe the quality of life we have in Ontario makes us competitive in itself.

Mr Bradley: The Treasurer is living in a world somewhat as he lived in when he was in opposition, a world that is somewhat Utopian. But the fact is that today we live in a very competitive world. We live, first of all, in a world where there is a serious recession in this country, and particularly in this province. We live in a world where the level of competition in international trade is unprecedented. Whether we like the free trade agreement or not, it is in effect. The federal government has implemented it and it is talking seriously about a free trade agreement with Mexico.

In view of that and in view of the circumstances that he faced, and I recognize that he does not want to be slashing programs wildly to be able to bring his deficit way down, or to balance the budget, or anything of that nature, I ask the Treasurer this question: Why did he and the busy Chair of Management Board not get together and carefully scrutinize and examine every program within every ministry to determine those which are no longer relevant to 1991 Ontario and those which may not have to—if it is a new program—proceed at this moment in time, or to stage programs in such a way as to allow himself more flexibility to devote the resources that he had at the present time, without raising taxes, to fighting the recession in the most appropriate way?

Hon Mr Laughren: That is a most appropriate question and the member would not believe it if I told him how much time the Chair of Management Board and I have spent together in the last few months.

Mr Bradley: Qualify that.

Hon Mr Laughren: No, I will not qualify it at all. I can tell the member that what he suggested is exactly what we did. We examined all the programs of every ministry, and if he talks to the ministers they will tell him how they came to Management Board, under the able chairship of the Chair of Management Board, and now the Minister of Health as well, and they will tell him that all of those programs received very close scrutiny. It is one reason, though, that we feel we are going to put in place a Treasury Board which is going to help us look at a whole reallocation process, because I do not quarrel with the premise of the member's question. I think it is essential that we take a look at entire programs, rather than nibbling around the edges at all of the existing programs. So I do not disagree with what the member suggests at all.

Mr Bradley: The change from Management Board to Treasury Board is simply a change of name and an effort by the Treasurer to wrest some of the control over the economy back to his department and away from the Chair of Management Board.

The Speaker: And the new question?

Mr Bradley: However, you want a new question, no doubt.

TAX INCREASES

Mr Bradley: The Treasurer will remember that last week a number of Ontario truckers in rather desperate financial straits were protesting unfair competition from American transporters. During this particular protest, and he will recall the various methods they used to call attention to their concerns, they indicated that the cost of doing business in this province was making them uncompetitive and that one of these factors was the price of fuel. The Treasurer is raising gasoline taxes by 30% over the next eight months. He is raising diesel fuel taxes by 32% in the next eight months.

How does driving up truck and rail transportation costs help business compete against jurisdictions south of the border, which are undergoing in some cases restraint measures? Second, how do the massive tax increases that he has announced help our struggling trucking industry compete with the lower-cost alternatives from the United States?

1400

Hon Mr Laughren: I wish the member had asked his own colleagues that question before they deregulated the trucking industry in this province.

First of all, I do understand the difficulty in the trucking industry, and I think that the member, being fair-minded, will recognize the fact that just last week the Minister of Transportation put a moratorium on the issuance of new licences. That was a major commitment to the trucking industry in this province.

I acknowledge the fact that the trucking industry does not like any kind of tax increase on gasoline or diesel fuel. I understand that. It is one of the components of their costs. I would also put to the member that the basic problem in the trucking industry is not the price of gasoline; it simply is not. It is much, much more complex than that. There simply are a lot of truckers competing for less business than is healthy for the industry. I think the member should understand that we are not prepared at this point to make exemptions on the tax levels.

As well—I see the Speaker looking at me; I will sit down and wait for the supplementary.

Mr Bradley: Today the major North American auto makers announced further substantial financial losses, which will be reflected, no doubt, in continued layoffs of Canadian workers who make parts and who assemble North American vehicles.

Would the Treasurer not agree that increasing taxes on many of these vehicles and increasing fuel taxes at a time when the auto industry is deep in recession and facing unprecedented competition from south of the border and from offshore will cause further loss of jobs in yet another vital sector of our economy, a sector which in itself is important but also affects so many other areas that supply it?

Hon Mr Laughren: One does not make these tax moves without worrying about what the member is talking about. At the same time, I believe that the position of this government and its commitment to energy conservation and the environment is not something on which we are prepared to compromise. Those changes were both for conservation purposes and for environmental purposes, and we stand behind them. We are proud of those moves.

I might add as well that by doubling the gas guzzler tax we are simply doing what has already been done in the United States with gas guzzlers. There is no question about that.

I think the member should understand, as a former Minister of the Environment, that one cannot just be populist about environmental regulations and environmental controls in a commitment to the environment. Our commitment to the environment is resolute and we do not intend to compromise it by making exemptions on things like gasoline taxes.

Mr Bradley: The response of the Treasurer would be much more credible if indeed he would designate those funds specifically for the purposes which he has mentioned. But they of course are going into the consolidated revenue fund, as we all recognize.

The Treasurer has clearly ignored the advice given by his own members on the standing committee on finance and economic affairs by the cross-border shopping task force during the pre-budget consultations. That group which made the presentation, including many of the mayors of those municipalities representing retail businesses and representing the municipalities themselves, suggested that many Ontario communities are hit hard by cross-border shopping and recommended decreasing, not increasing, the gasoline tax and other consumer taxes on such things as cigarettes and alcoholic beverages—those alcoholic beverages are reflected in the price of meals as well in communities across the border—until at least after the recession recedes and Ontario regains its competitive edge. What made the Treasurer increase these taxes against the best advice from those experiencing that problem?

Hon Mr Laughren: We got a lot of advice from a lot of people, and if we had followed all of the advice, the deficit would have been a lot higher than \$9.7 billion, I can tell the member.

I think the member should understand that the whole issue of cross-border shopping is one that is bedevilling a lot of us; it is a very, very complex problem. It is quite serious; I do not mean to minimize its seriousness at all. There are 14 border crossings, I believe, in the province and it is a problem in those communities. There are border crossings in other provinces as well and it is a problem there too. The federal government is trying to wrestle with the problem; it does not know what to do either. We have asked for advice on this specific issue from the standing committee to see what its opinion is on what we should do.

As well, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology is working with the mayors of the border communities. The Minister of Revenue has written to the federal government asking for support in the collection of provincial

taxes at the border. It is not as though we are simply sitting on the sidelines watching it happen, but it is a very complex problem. We are not giving up on it, because we would like to see a solution as well.

ANTI-RECESSION PROGRAM

Mr Harris: Since the Premier is in Detroit today, no doubt picking up a couple of shirts while he is there, my question is of the Treasurer. Yesterday the Treasurer told us that by allowing the deficit to rise to a whopping \$10 billion, he was going to create or sustain 70,000 jobs. I assume what the Treasurer is doing is saying that by allowing this \$9.7 billion, or close to \$10 billion, to be in the economy, 70,000 jobs would be created. That is 70,000 jobs, at a total cost of \$9.7 billion, and it works out to nearly \$140,000 per job. I wonder if the Treasurer could help me tell all the phone callers I am getting to my office from unemployed Ontarians exactly where they can find these \$140,000-a-year jobs.

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, I want to assure the leader of the third party that the Premier is not only in the United States today; he is also in Windsor, where he is going to take part in a ceremony where there are going to be some new manufacturing jobs created.

The 70,000 jobs referred to in the budget are very clearly a reflection of our commitment to fight the recession. What we are saying—and I thought it was clear in the budget statement—is that if we had taken the advice of the party opposite and some others at the federal level and reduced the deficit to zero or a balanced budget, we would have cost this province at least 70,000 jobs, and there are other people who say it would be closer to 80,000 jobs. So we decided that for this year we were going to fight the recession, maintain those jobs and maintain those essential programs in Ontario.

Mr Harris: I hear what the Treasurer is saying; I just do not know how it adds up that \$140,000 per job that he is saving—how he feels this is good value. However, that is NDP economics.

I would like to read from the Treasurer's own budget on page 39: Anti-recession spending of \$670 million will result in 18,200 new jobs. Further down this chart it lists tax increases of \$670 million, resulting in only 4,000 job losses. I wonder if the Treasurer could explain to me how it is that, spending \$670 million, somehow or other this money creates four times more jobs than are lost by removing \$670 million from the economy. Can the Treasurer tell me how it is four times more jobs when he spends the money than it is job losses for \$670 million worth of tax increases?

1410

Hon Mr Laughren: I would be glad to try. First of all, I should say that when we launched that anti-recession program, we thought it would create about 14,000 jobs. As it turned out, it is going to create 18,000 jobs, so we are getting better value for our money. That anti-recession package is the most aggressive anti-recession package in all of Canada, and we are very proud of the fact that we decided to fight the recession.

I think the leader of the third party would agree that the money spent was direct job creation in capital works projects—very direct—whereas there is not such a direct relationship between jobs lost with tax increases as there is with direct job creation under our capital works program.

Mr Harris: The Treasurer cannot have it both ways. He cannot tell us the deficit, this \$9 billion, is going to create all these jobs when at the same time he has a difference of four to one. If he increases taxes, it only loses one fourth of a job; if somehow or other he increases the deficit, it creates four. The Treasurer cannot have it both ways.

The Treasurer said in response to my questions, and yesterday he said in response to this \$10-billion deficit, that it was 70,000 jobs—he said maybe even 80,000 jobs—and that he is going to fight the recession. That is why the Treasurer thinks it is okay to have a \$10-billion deficit. Can the Treasurer explain to me why, in the second year, in the third year, in the fourth year of his forecast, when he says we will be out of the recession, we will have growth, everything will be hunky-dory, we will still have \$6 billion, \$7 billion, \$8 billion, \$9 billion worth of deficits, when there is no recession?

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, I do find it a little bit much to be lectured by the member from the third party on job creation when his federal counterparts cut \$100 million out of the Canadian jobs strategy in their budget. We make no apologies whatsoever for making a determination this year to fight the recession in the province, a recession that even the member of the third party I think will admit was contributed to mightily by his federal counterparts.

Mr Harris: I guess the answer is, when you do not have an answer or what you are doing is stupid, you blame somebody else.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr Harris: Because the Premier is over gassing up with cheap gas in Detroit, my second question is also for the Treasurer.

Mr White: Mr Speaker, on a point of order: I believe in the standing orders there are comments with regard to allegations. It is certainly against practice to make allegations about any member, particularly one who is absent. The leader of the third party has twice made allegations about the Premier that are unfounded. He now states not "if" or "perhaps" but "while." I think it is outrageous to permit that.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party certainly caught their attention. There is definitely a difference of opinion and that is to be expected. I also expect that all members will temper their language as they ask questions and respond.

Would the leader of the third party place his question, please.

Mr Harris: Perhaps he is over getting cigarettes for the member for Durham Centre.

The Speaker: Would the leader of the third party place his question, please.

Mr Harris: I wonder if I could get on to my second question to the Treasurer. I would like to quote some of his own words of wisdom from 1988.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock for a minute, please.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Just wait a minute. Just be calm for a moment. Members will note that I have stopped the clock. I want to draw a couple of observations to your attention. I will in a moment recognize the member for Oshawa for his alleged point of order or privilege. I ask members to recall that by practice what we try to do is that if there are points of order we try to raise them outside of question period so as not to interfere with members' opportunities to both ask questions and respond. I think that for the most part those of you who are familiar with the rules will know that allegations are not easy to determine in terms of the rules, that usually we have a difference of opinion, often a point of irritation, but not often a point of order. I will ask the member to briefly state his point of order.

Hon Mr Pilkey: Mr Speaker, you have very aptly served the purpose of my interjection. Thank you.

The Speaker: It is obviously not a point of order. If we are ready to proceed, if I recall correctly, we were with the leader of the third party who was going to succinctly place his question.

Mr Harris: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I am sorry I have offended the member. He might be checking out incinerators if he wants to dump garbage in Durham. I do not know.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Harris: My question is this: I would like to quote the words of wisdom from 1988. The now Treasurer said: "The Liberal government has put a siphon directly into the pockets of working people in northern Ontario. Those pockets will soon be empty if this government keeps up." He went on to say, "With gas tax increases they have hurt, not helped, northerners." Could he tell us what has changed between then and now.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am pleased that the leader of the third party, given the fact that we have some very serious economic problems in this province, has switched from his somewhat silly, scurrilous allegations about the Premier to a more serious economic question. I appreciate that.

There is no question that the problems in northern Ontario are serious. Not only do we have the highest unemployment rate anywhere in the province, but there are entire communities that seem to be under siege, including places like Kapuskasing, Elliot Lake and Sault Ste Marie. It is very serious.

We know that overall in Ontario, with a loss of 260,000 jobs last year, we cannot—and the leader of the third party would be the first one to complain if we did—move in and utilize the public sector to pick up the entire tab. We know we simply cannot do that. The leader asked specifically about taxes, I believe, in northern Ontario, and gas taxes in particular. I do wish the private sector, the

petroleum industry, would get the message that we are unhappy with the way the pricing of gasoline is occurring in northern Ontario. We are not happy with that at all. It seems to me it would be in their interest to do something about that. We know as well that the—

The Speaker: Have you finished?

Hon Mr Laughren: All right.

1420

Mr Harris: The double-barrelled gas tax increases, surely the Treasurer will know, come at a time when Ontarians cannot afford the higher costs of doing business.

Two years ago, here is what his party called gasoline taxes: The Treasurer said they were regressive. He said it was a tax that hit northerners. He said it was a tax that hit seniors and the disabled. He said it was a tax that hit school boards. He said it was a tax that hit middle- and low-income groups. His party voted against that tax when the Liberals brought these increases in, as we all remember, and that was at a time of relative prosperity in this province.

Now that we are in a recession, is the Treasurer telling us that in a recession somehow or other these taxes take on a different meaning and are not recessive, do not hit seniors, do not hit northerners, do not hit school boards, and are good for us now? Is that what he is trying to tell us?

Hon Mr Laughren: I guess none of us ever likes to pay more taxes on anything. I understand that, but at the same time—

Mr Eves: What about what you said in 1988 and what you are saying now?

Hon Mr Laughren: I thought the member wanted an answer.

Interjections.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am responding to the question by the leader of the third party. It seems to me that—as I started out to say before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Willowdale—at a time of recession we had some very difficult decisions to make. We could have not raised those taxes and, in return, either allowed the deficit to rise higher or cut programs in the major expenditure areas such as health and education. Quite frankly, we made a clear decision to fight the recession rather than to sacrifice those much-needed programs.

Mr Harris: Fight it on the backs, according to the Treasurer's words, of the poor, of seniors, of the tourism industry.

In this House a couple of days ago, the Minister of Transportation said, "It is crucial to remember that regardless of the assistance our government can provide, the Ontario trucking industry must be in a position to compete." He said the provincial government could not do everything. There were other responsibilities, other governments, other things that were causing it, but he said, and certainly left the impression, that the Ontario government would do everything it could within its power to help the trucking industry compete.

I wonder if the Treasurer could tell us how increasing gasoline and diesel fuel taxes contributes, in his small way, to helping the trucking industry compete.

Hon Mr Laughren: Coming from the world's number one disciple of deregulation, that question is a bit hard to take. As I said earlier to my critic from the official opposition, I understand the problem in the trucking industry. I do not believe it is entirely based on gasoline prices or gasoline taxes. The Minister of Transportation last week announced a moratorium on new licences. I think that went a very major way to helping resolve the problems in the trucking industry.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Cleary: The Treasurer knows that Ontario's net farm income will decline by some 15% this year, to the lowest level in five years. The Treasurer should be aware that agriculture is an important part of the rural economy and yet he has refused to make any commitment to funding the new federal-provincial net income stabilization account program, which his Minister of Agriculture and Food strongly supported last fall.

In this open letter from both the Ontario Federation of Agriculture and the Ontario Agricultural Commodity Council, representing over 80,000 farmers in this province—and that is 80,000 farmers—the letter calls on the NDP to implement the NISA program this year. I want to know why the Treasurer can find \$220 million in his budget to increase pay to civil servants but cannot find a mere \$10 million to fund the NISA program this year?

Hon Mr Laughren: I appreciate the question from the member for Cornwall, and I know of his abiding interest in the farm community, but I want to assure the member that this government has an absolutely fierce commitment to maintaining and supporting the farm community. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has already announced major expenditure programs. I think the member for Cornwall is not being fair when he implies that we are not doing enough; we are doing the best we can.

Mr Cleary: Two weeks ago the federal government contributed its contribution for the net income stabilization account program to encourage provincial support of this program. If the province commits \$5 million to the program next year, the federal government will pay out \$35 million to Ontario farmers this spring under the NISA program. If the province pays its \$10-million share this year, the federal government will pay out over \$40 million to farmers this spring. This means an extra \$50 million going to the farmers this spring, when they need it most, and costing the province only 20 cents of each dollar of support. If the province refuses to make a commitment, farmers will get nothing, and that is nothing.

When will the Treasurer listen to the farmers of this province and support the NISA program?

Hon Mr Laughren: We do indeed listen to the farmers in this province and we have now a Minister of Agriculture and Food who understands the needs of the farm community as no other Minister of Agriculture and Food has. I do understand the needs of the farming community,

and all I can assure the member for Cornwall is that, in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and Food, we will be keeping a very close eye on the farm community and we will do what we can for the farmers in this province.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mr Stockwell: Today the border towns reacted angrily to the Treasurer's announcement. The mayor of Sarnia called it a neutron bomb for border towns. The mayor of St Catharines this morning on a talk show was beside himself. In fact, the Niagara region chairperson, Wilbert Dick, said the tax hikes on gasoline and other commodities are aggravating matters for those trying to keep Ontario shoppers from crossing the border.

In Sault Ste Marie, on 23 January, the Premier said: "We are looking at all kinds of suggestions. I don't have anything to announce. We are going to do our part." Is the Treasurer's part raising taxes on gasoline, raising taxes on alcohol and raising taxes on cigarettes, thereby creating more jobs south of the border than are being created in this province? Is that his answer to the border towns?

Hon Mr Laughren: I tried to indicate earlier what a difficult problem the cross-border shopping one is. It is extremely complex, very difficult. As a matter of fact—

An hon member: Blame the feds.

1430

Hon Mr Laughren: No, I am not blaming the feds. I want to quote something that the federal Minister of Revenue, Otto Jelinek, said, "The federal government will not take steps to block Canadians from shopping in the United States because that would be contrary to Conservative philosophy."

Interjections.

Hon Mr Laughren: Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: You did not have anything more to add, did you?

Hon Mr Laughren: No.

Mr Stockwell: What has that got to do with the question? When is the Treasurer going to stand up and defend his taxes? No Tory was in the back room putting a gun to the Treasurer's head to raise those taxes. Why does he not stand up and defend his decisions? Border towns are closing. Gas prices are going up. Let him defend his budget, his \$9.7-billion debt, his billion-dollar increase in taxes. Jobs are being lost.

The Speaker: The question?

Mr Stockwell: The question stands: Let the Treasurer defend his budget. Answer the people in the border towns.

Hon Mr Laughren: It is very difficult to give a—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I take it we all heard the question. I guess now that perhaps the person who asked the question would like to hear a response. I would like to hear the response.

Hon Mr Laughren: It is difficult to give a thoughtful and meaningful response when the members who ask the questions are hyperventilating.

Mr Stockwell: I am not the only one. Take a look at the taxpayers.

Hon Mr Laughren: I rest my case. The member is hyperventilating again.

If the members opposite would think seriously about the taxes that we did raise, they would realize they were not simply revenue-generating moves. They were moves that were based on environmental principles, on energy conservation principles and on health principles. It seems to me that those are very defensible tax moves.

Finally, Mr Speaker, because I can see you looking at me, I must say again to the members opposite that we in this government are proud of the fact that in this year we decided to fight the most severe recession in this province in 40 years.

NATIVE SELF-POLICING

Mrs Mathysen: My question is to the Solicitor General and it pertains to first nations policing. Given that this government has a commitment to working towards native self-government, what is the Solicitor General doing with respect to self-policing arrangements for first nations?

Hon Mr Farnan: I and my colleagues are committed not just to the concept of self-policing but to the reality of self-policing for first nations people. We are negotiating currently several first nations agreements with the federal government and first nations. We have ongoing negotiations for province-wide first nations policing that will cover the period 1991 through 1996. We have active negotiations with the Nishnawbe-Aski Nation, again in the area of self-policing. We have a model example among the Six Nations of a self-government in policing area. I am optimistic that we can enhance and accelerate the move towards self-government in the area of self-policing and I am optimistic I will be coming back to the House with very important announcements in this area.

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Brown: I have a question about public cynicism in the political process. I have a question about integrity. I have a question about trust. I have a question about the politician's responsibility to the people. My question is about Elliot Lake.

On 31 January 1990 the member for Algoma, now the Minister of Natural Resources, told the Premier at that time that he must "direct Ontario Hydro to purchase all of the uranium it needs for its nuclear generators from Ontario sources." In August of the same year the present Premier confirmed that commitment. In March of this year at the New Democratic convention, the NDP unanimously passed a resolution which read, "Be it resolved that the Ontario New Democratic government direct Ontario Hydro to buy 100% of its uranium supplies from Elliot Lake mines."

These commitments by the New Democratic Party are clear, they are straightforward, they are indisputable. They stand on their own as the policy of the NDP government.

Yet at 2:30 yesterday afternoon the Premier, through Ontario Hydro, announced that he was cancelling Ontario

Hydro's contracts with Denison Mines, and 1,100 people are losing their jobs because he cancelled them.

I have a question to the Minister of Northern Development. I want her to tell the people of Elliot Lake how she can stand in this House, knowing that she has betrayed her government's promise, she has betrayed her party's position, she has betrayed her own integrity and, most important, she has betrayed the workers and the families of Elliot Lake.

Hon Miss Martel: I know the passion that the member who represents that riding feels. Let me respond on behalf of the government.

First of all, I should clarify one point with respect to the announcement he made at the convention. He would know that the referral motion read very clearly, and I point out, "The elements of the planning process should include an acknowledgement of the ONDP's stand on 100% uranium sourcing."

When this government came to power, for the first time ever it was allowed to see the confidential documents with respect to the contracts between Hydro and Denison and Rio Algom. We were stunned to learn that the fact of the matter is that over the last 10 years this province, Ontario Hydro, has paid over \$1.2 billion in premiums to those companies over and above the price of those contracts.

For us to continue that contract at Denison Mines would have cost Ontario Hydro and in the end the people of this province over \$500 million more. That is not a position that this government, Ontario Hydro, nor the taxpayers of the province could afford to take in this time of recession.

I am pleased to say on behalf of my ministry that we have put together a working committee. That group is meeting with us on 13 May to give to us its ideas with respect to diversification, not only in Elliot Lake but on the North Shore. The member for Algoma-Manitoulin is a part of that, as the federal member is, and we look forward to meeting with representatives of the community at that point.

[Applause]

Mr Scott: People are put out of jobs, 1,100 people were put out of work, and you applaud. What's going on?

The Speaker: The member for St George-St David may know that his colleague is waiting to place a supplementary, and I would like to be able to hear the supplementary.

1440

Mr Brown: That is nonsense. The minister knew, because Premier Peterson, in response to a question from the now Minister of Natural Resources, told her that last session. He told them that it would be four or five times world price. They still made the commitment, and they made it over and over again.

They have cancelled their promise for a \$400-million northern fund. They have cancelled their promise of \$100 million for four-laning in the north. The Minister of Northern Development herself promised equalization of gas prices, and yesterday they increased gas prices by 3.4 cents.

The Speaker: The supplementary?

Mr Brown: The cancellation of the Ontario Hydro contract means that there will be 85% unemployment in Elliot Lake.

The Speaker: And your supplementary.

Mr Brown: After telling Denison Mines that their jobs are cancelled, is the minister going to tell Rio mines that their jobs are cancelled? Is she going to cancel Elliot Lake?

Hon Miss Martel: The former Premier never told anyone, either in this House or outside, that over the last 10 years Ontario Hydro had spent \$1.2 billion in premiums over and above the price of those contracts.

Mr Brown: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It is in Hansard. He clearly told the member what the situation was.

The Speaker: Not a point of order, but the member for Fort William.

Mrs McLeod: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I had thought that perhaps the minister had inadvertently indicated in her first answer that there had been a payment over and above a contracted price. I think that that is a fairly serious issue. I was also privy to information about those contracts during my term as minister. I do not have a recollection of there having been a payment over and above contract price. I would ask that the minister check the facts and determine whether in reality what was being paid was a difference in market price, not a premium over and above the contract, so the record can be corrected for the sake of accuracy.

The Speaker: The member may know that it is not a point of order, but it certainly is an excellent question.

Mrs McLeod: I would appreciate that the inaccuracy be corrected. It could be a serious piece of misinformation.

Hon Miss Martel: If I said that price was over and above the contract price, I will withdraw. What I meant to say was that in fact the \$1.2 million was over and above what the price on the market or the spot price would have been, and when we came to that conclusion, it was the decision of this government that we could no longer continue making those kinds of payments. We want to use part of that money instead to plan for economic diversification, not only in Elliot Lake but in all those communities along the North Shore, so that five years from now we will not be in the same position that we find ourselves in now, that is, a total reliance on the uranium industry and nothing else.

Two more points that I would like to raise: Members of this House know very well that Ontario Hydro is in negotiation with Rio Algom at this point. This government is not in a position to make any comments with respect to those negotiations, but as I said in Elliot Lake and I will repeat here, we believe that Ontario Hydro does have an obligation to the community. When those negotiations are complete, we will be able to give the House the details of that obligation.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Mr Villeneuve: My question is to the Treasurer: He knows that farmers have told him, and so does the Minister of Agriculture and Food, that funding GRIP, the gross revenue insurance plan, without NISA does not complete the plan. Quite obviously he has totally ignored NISA, the net income stabilization account. Therefore, farmers cannot expect a complete plan. The Treasurer is funding GRIP, and then he is funding a \$50-million interest rate rebate program. However, in the budget for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food we have had an increase of \$21 million when what he has announced will cost more than \$60 million. What is he cutting in Agriculture and Food?

Hon Mr Laughren: No, that is not fair. Not only are we funding what the Minister of Agriculture and Food has already announced, but negotiations, as I understand it, are still ongoing between the provincial Minister of Agriculture and Food and the federal government on the NISA program.

Mr Villeneuve: The Treasurer has made a mistake. The budget for Agriculture and Food last year was \$555 million. The projected budget for Agriculture and Food is now \$576 million. By my arithmetic, that is an increase of \$21 million. The Treasurer has announced \$50 million in interest rebates, and the participation in GRIP will be slightly more than \$10 million. Where is he cutting?

Hon Mr Laughren: I can understand the confusion on the part of the member, but that is simply not the case. We have not made the cuts which the member is implying. I would be very happy to get back to the member on more specific details, but the member is simply wrong in his inference that we are cutting these programs.

Mrs Haslam: It seems to be an agriculture day, except this time my question is for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. We all know that farmers are experiencing difficult times, especially in this recession. They are hurting. We have been talking about budgets, so I would like to know how the ministry's portion of our budget is going to help the farmers.

Hon Mr Buchanan: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to answer that question. As many of the members I am sure are aware, there are two programs that have been announced so far, totalling about \$90 million, in the budget for agriculture. The farm interest assistance will provide assistance to those farmers in greatest need. The GRIP program will provide assistance to grain and oil-seed producers as well as horticultural producers.

I would like to point out to the member, though, some things that I believe the agricultural and rural community should take note of, and these are things that in fact were not in the budget. I am speaking about two things in particular. One is the fact that the farm tax rebate has remained intact. The second is the fact that this budget, unlike budgets of the past, did not announce programs and then lay the cost of those programs on the municipalities. Farmers and rural people are very pleased that this government is not putting the cost of new programs on the property owners out in rural Ontario, and for that, I am sure, the farmers and rural people in Ontario are going to be very pleased.

Mrs Haslam: Back to debt control. I understand that the information and the program that was introduced from the Hayes report dealt with the short term. I wanted to know if there is something further we could look forward to, especially in debt relief, from the ministry.

Hon Mr Buchanan: Yes. There has been a lot of noise in the House today about the NISA program. I would like to correct a couple of the figures that have been thrown around.

The federal government threw a proposal on the table two weeks ago for third-line defence. Everyone should know that the ministers of agriculture across the country and the federal minister agreed that third-line defence money, which is assistance to farmers in greatest need, would be funded by the federal government. At the last minute, the 11th hour, the federal government threw a proposal on the table to try to bring the provinces into funding the third line of defence, which more or less breaks the spirit of what was agreed to in Regina a couple of months ago. We will continue to negotiate with the federal government to get a better deal on NISA. Second, we are looking at a long-term interest relief program which we think will help all the farmers in Ontario who are in greatest need, and not target one group or another depending on what crop they grow.

1450

INCOME TAX

Mr Nixon: Perhaps if I may use the last few seconds for a question of the Treasurer. Exactly a year ago, actually 26 April 1990, the Treasurer said in the House: "In this province, a single person earning the minimum wage of \$5 an hour will still pay income tax in this province totalling \$368 a year. That fact makes a more important statement about this government than all the statements this Treasurer has ever made in this House or ever will make."

Yesterday, the Treasurer announced what he called the largest enrichment in the history of the Ontario tax reduction program. We had already removed 625,000 who pay federal tax from the rolls, and he has raised that to 700,000.

I want to point out to the Treasurer that in Ontario under his leadership a single person starts paying Ontario income tax when his earnings exceed \$8,500. In fact, an individual earning the minimum wage of \$5.40—that is up 40 cents an hour since a year ago, and in spite of the NDP promise to change the minimum wage there has been no action—can expect to pay \$400 in Ontario income tax. How can the minister, having made such a definitive statement previously, now come before the House with a budget that does not move towards correcting the same anomaly that he criticized a year ago? Who is in charge there? The Treasurer or Attila the Hun?

Hon Mr Laughren: I have been called a lot of things in my day, but never Attila the Hun. I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that we committed \$50 million to the Ontario tax reduction program. That is indeed the most substantial commitment that has ever been made to low-income taxpayers with dependents in Ontario. We are very proud of that. It raises to 700,000 the number of people

who will not be paying provincial income taxes now because of that.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Members may wish to welcome to our gallery today a former member for Northumberland, Howard Sheppard.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Cousens: Mr Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege. During question period a certain amount of time was lost due to the time taken by members of the House who in their own minds had points of order to make, and this caused the clock to pass without there being an opportunity for more questions being taken. In order to address this point of privilege, I would appreciate it, Mr Speaker, if in the future, if members are going to sacrifice the time of all members of the House by calling for questions of personal privilege or order, the clock can be stopped and those points be done after question period. Would you take that under advisement?

The Speaker: First of all, I very much appreciate the point the member has raised. You may recall that earlier today I mentioned how it is our practice—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I intend to complete my remarks. The member may recall that I mentioned earlier that it would be appreciated if members would raise alleged points of order and privilege outside of question period. The Speaker is placed in a very awkward position. If a member stands to raise a point of order I have a responsibility to listen to it. What it does, of course, is help destroy the time that is set aside for members to ask questions. I do take what you have raised under advisement, and I will be communicating with you later.

Mr Cousens: In that spirit, possibly I can have time to ask my question.

The Speaker: I am sure it is an excellent question which you will bring back to the House tomorrow.

MOTION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that Mr Dadamo and Mr Malkowski exchange places in the order of precedence for private members' public business.

Motion agreed to.

PETITIONS

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Brown: I have a number of petitions to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong

anchor industry in Elliot Lake any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I agree with this petition, and I will sign it.

Mr Ramsay: "Whereas the cancellation of the out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment in Elliot Lake is more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I agree with this petition, and I have put my name to it also.

Mrs Sullivan: I have a petition from a number of people addressed to the Parliament of Ontario, reading:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the

community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I concur with this petition and I have affixed my signature.

The Speaker: Stop the clock for a minute, please. I just remind members before we continue that if you do have a great number of petitions and they are all the same, we do have a time constraint. Members will recall that we have 20 minutes allotted for the presentation of petitions, so guide yourselves accordingly. You may wish to simply read the bottom portion of it. The time is yours, but it will fleet.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Cooper: I have a petition signed by 62 people, and it was sent to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. It is to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

"We, the undersigned, petition the government of Ontario to amend the existing legislation with respect to automobile insurance in order to return to the victims of motor vehicle accidents the right to institute legal actions without the present threshold requirement."

1500

TAXATION

Mr Sorbara: I have a petition that has an extremely long preamble to it. I will not read the preamble, but it is signed by about 45 people from in and around my riding. It petitions the government to lower the taxes the people of the province pay.

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Chiarelli: I will read the full preamble because I think the people from Elliot Lake are quite concerned. It is signed by a number of people and addressed to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the

community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

It is signed by a number of people. I have affixed my signature to it and I agree with the petition.

Mr Offer: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario and it reads:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have affixed my signature at the bottom and am in full support of this petition.

Mr Miclash: I have a petition that is of particular interest to the people of Elliot Lake and to the people in northern Ontario as well, and it is to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the

community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have attached my name to that petition as well.

Mrs McLeod: As a resident of northern Ontario, I am happy to join in presenting a petition on behalf of the residents of Elliot Lake and to state once again their concerns for the benefit of this House and for the record.

"To the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

Ms Poole: I too have a petition which is of critical interest to the people of Elliot Lake, and as a former northerner I am very proud to present it on their behalf.

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have proudly appended my signature to this petition.

Mr H. O'Neil: I have a similar petition. In support of the member for Algoma-Manitoulin and in support of the people of Elliot Lake, I would also like to present this, which reads:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

Mr Sola: As a former northern Ontarian and having been raised in the neighbouring city of Sudbury, I am proud to join my colleagues in petitioning the Parliament of Ontario in the following manner:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

It is signed by about 80 people.

1510

Mr Offer: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced, and without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have affixed my name to the bottom of this petition and am in full support.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

BUDGET DEBATE

Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Mr Bradley: I am pleased to be able to have the first response, at the very least, if not the only response to the budget that has been presented to the House by the new Treasurer of the province of Ontario.

As I begin my remarks this afternoon, I must say I was genuinely surprised by what I saw in the budget. Sometimes one can make a prediction, and there were a lot of predictions and a lot of speculation took place. But I was genuinely surprised by a few things in the budget that I will deal with in just a few moments.

Of course, the fact which emerges quickly, as one reads the budget, as one flips through to the relevant sections of the budget, is that we have an unprecedented deficit in Ontario of some \$10 billion, something that I think not too many people contemplated.

I know there was some jocular speculation about how high the budgetary deficit might go in Ontario, but I think few people were aware that the Treasurer was serious about raising the level of the deficit to some \$10 billion, and subsequent to that, and I think it is as important, to I believe \$9 billion the next year and \$8 billion the two years after.

One could have anticipated in the deep recession—and we are in a deep recession at the present time. We incurred a deficit of over \$3 billion back in 1982 when Frank Miller was the Treasurer of Ontario, and I think it was expected at that time that we would use the fiscal tools we had within the responsibility of the provincial government to address the circumstances that faced us.

Most of my colleagues and I expected that we would see from the Treasurer an increased deficit. As he said, we would see about \$3 billion in this fiscal year and we might see an increased deficit of another \$1 billion or perhaps \$2 billion, and he knew even in those circumstances he would face some criticism. But to open the budget and find that the deficit is \$10 billion really has the effect of realizing the worst anticipation of those in the community of what kind of fiscal control we would have under an NDP government in this province.

No one expected we were going to see a government that is aiming for a balanced budget at this time. Economic times do not dictate that. It would be extremely unfair to suggest that would be the case either this year or next year or perhaps even the year after. That would be unreasonable to expect of the Treasurer of this government, if we were not to make the situation worse in this province. But I believe that by having a \$10-billion deficit, we are going to have an effect which is unfortunate for this province.

One of those effects is psychological. I have never been one who is a great fan of the bond-rating agencies, be they here in Canada or in the United States, but it is one of the realities we face. I guess one of the things I said to the Treasurer today as part of one of my questions was that I wish we did not live in a difficult world. I wish we did not live in a highly competitive world. I wish we were facing circumstances in Canada and in Ontario, as we did in the post-Second World War period, where there was considerable growth in this country, where there was considerable economic activity which would produce employment for our young people and for those who were advanced in age. But we are not in those circumstances today. We are in much more difficult circumstances.

We are in the midst of a North American recession, one which has been made worse, in my view, by some of the policies of the federal government. Each of the government members has a sheet on his or her desk which will say what he or she is supposed to say, which is (a) that it is the GST; (b) that it is high interest rates; and (c) that it is free trade that is causing all the problems. Indeed, I think with some justification one could make a case that each of those contributes to the problems that exist in the province of Ontario, but that does not mean you simply hide behind the circumstances that exist on a national level or behind federal government policies in order to take no specific action which is beneficial to this province.

Therefore, we have to face reality in our province. We face a world where we have a free trade agreement. I happen to have disagreed with that free trade agreement. I think if one examined the details of the agreement very carefully, one could not help but come to the conclusion that many of our industries would be attracted south of the border because they would not have a reason to stay in Canada, that there were not those tariff barriers, that there was not the need for the presence of even a branch plant in our province. I think we could have foreseen the deindustrialization of Ontario if this agreement were allowed to proceed as it has. Now we have the federal government talking about a free trade agreement with Mexico.

Both Premier Peterson and the current Premier indicated their opposition to these free trade agreements, and both indicated they would do what they could to attempt to thwart those agreements. Unfortunately, neither Premier Peterson nor the current Premier—though I will chide him in the House from time to time in perhaps a humorous fashion or a less-than-humorous fashion about making the claim that he was not going to co-operate in the implementation of the free trade agreement and then turning around and doing so, the reality is that we do not have that option, that there is little a provincial government can do if the federal government is determined to proceed.

Once again, we live in an economic recession. We live in a world where there is a free trade agreement with a huge trading partner to the south, a large economic and military power. We live in a circumstance where other countries are becoming real competitors against North Americans in terms of the products that they produce. We have a European common market which is coming together, a European Community which is getting ever stronger, is breaking down its own barriers and is coming across as being somewhat of a trade threat to those of us in North America.

My colleagues from the Niagara Peninsula would know—the member for Niagara Falls is present and she is one of the people who would know—the effects on the grape and wine industry of that kind of competition, not just from the free trade agreement in the US but from the GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, of which we are a signatory. We face that reality. Therefore, when we want to ensure that we have jobs for people in this province in the future, we have to be sure that we can retain the industries and the businesses that are here and that we can attract new businesses.

I have mentioned in this House on more than one occasion that it may seem somewhat unusual, but as a Treasury critic I do not come from a business background. My family is a labour union family, a family that worked in industry over the years. I have gone through all the cycles that some members of the House have gone through and that some of their families have gone through in terms of permanent layoffs, in terms of relocation from one community to another, in terms of my father reaching a circumstance where at 49 years of age he was given next to no notice of his termination of employment for no good reason. A whole portion of a plant was closed down by

then International Nickel, now called Inco. So I know the dislocation that exists.

1520

I know that we live in this world all of us would prefer did not exist, rather than in a world where we were without that kind of competition. When we live in this world, we have to be able to keep investment here, keep jobs here and attract new investment. I suggest to members that we do not do that by running huge deficits of the kind that are contemplated by this government. Again, the business community, while it will make some noise about a deficit, will understand a deficit that is used as a tool for fighting a recession. I think the progressive members of the business community would understand that and be supportive of that. What they look at, however, is the size of the deficit, and again, as we attempt to attract people to our province or to keep them here, they look and say the deficit is far too high.

The second thing they will look at is the fact that in the midst of a recession this government has chosen to increase taxes. If members look at the full years—they call it annualization, I guess—of the taxes that they are implementing in the government of Ontario today, it is about \$1 billion they would be taking out of the economy, and taking it out of a good cross-section. When I say “good,” I use that word advisedly; taking it out of a real cross-section of the community, not only of people who are already working, but of people who are not working, who have to have the transportation that they have and have to pay the money they pay for gasoline prices. I know particularly the people in the north and the east have registered complaints about this.

We have hit cigarettes and we have hit alcohol. Just because people are unemployed does not mean that they do not from time to time use cigarettes or alcohol as part of this society. Indeed, we promote and will be promoting Ontario wines in this House a couple of weeks from now, as they will be served here in the Legislature. I got an invitation to that. I think the Speaker is in charge of that or someone is in charge of it and I am glad to see that they are promoting our product. We are looking at raising taxes on those products.

It is going to hit everybody and I suggest that a deep recession is not the time for tax increases. In fact, leaving more money in the hands of consumers will allow them to make purchases which will have a good spinoff effect and which will in fact generate revenue for this government. I think the Treasurer is hoping that some of his policies will generate that kind of economic activity. I am not convinced that all of them will, but there are some measures in the budget, in fairness, that I think may have that effect. The government members will speak of those, extolling the virtues of those measures. I will leave it to the government members, knowing that they will carry out that responsibility on behalf of the Treasurer, as he himself has stated.

We also must look at how one governs in these circumstances. The people who are going to invest in Ontario look at that deficit, look at the tax increases, listen to some of the rhetoric that they hear from this government, which

is antibusiness rhetoric, at the very time they are trying to make some decisions. They will not always go before a television camera or talk to reporters about this, but very often when you run into these people on a casual basis you will find them expressing grave concern in some circumstances and uncertainty in other circumstances about Ontario.

I was talking to an individual the other day who was selling part of his operation and going to Florida, and he said, "Well, I'm going to watch over the next few years and see what happens." It is a major operation. He had reached a state where his taxes were extremely high even without the new tax increases. He had listened to the rhetoric and read the platform of the new government and said, "I simply will not continue to invest." This is not some kind of wild, right-wing ideologue we are talking about. He is a person who has had a lot of interest in a community in the Niagara Peninsula, has an interest in investing there and has seen his business grow rather considerably. He is now saying: "Hold on. I've just seen the deficit, I've just listened to the potential policies coming forward and I do not think I want to invest in Ontario."

That means jobs for my neighbours. I live in a neighbourhood where most of the people are auto workers; the overwhelming majority, in fact, in my particular neighbourhood, my street. On one side, two down, there are auto workers, perhaps three down across the street on the other side, all working in various plants in the city of St Catharines or in nearby Thorold. It is automotive parts in that particular case.

They are going to be worried when they see in the midst of a deep recession, at a time when they are facing really tough competition from offshore and from the United States, that this government is going to double one tax on vehicles. It is an enviable goal that the Treasurer has set out. In good economic times particularly, you try to achieve those goals. But we are really facing tough circumstances. I know the people in Windsor. I cannot believe that the people in Windsor would not understand that, and the people in Oakville, Ontario, and the people in the Chatham area and Tillsonburg and St Thomas and so on, in Oshawa and St Catharines.

These people recognize that the automotive industry is going through some tough times now. There is a shake-down out there; there is a rationalization. My prediction would be that we are going to see plants moving whole operations and parts of operations from the United States into Mexico and then backfilling the jobs from Canada into the United States.

We want to ensure that does not happen. One of the pluses we have going for us is that we have a good workforce in this province. We have a skilled workforce. Some of the people who have particular skills are aging at the present time and we do not have as many young people with those specific skills any more for industry, but we have a good, skilled workforce and we have a determined population within the plants in the province of Ontario to be competitive, to do the best job.

My fear is that with the policies we see in this budget, with the tax increases—and the Treasurer, in answer to one of my questions, said, "Well, of course, this is an environmental

tax." I know, of course, that that money is not going into any environmental fund, that in fact it is going into the consolidated revenue fund. In that way, he is the same as every other Treasurer in the province of Ontario. If there is one thing that Treasurers have in common, it is that they do not like designated funds. They like to horde all the money in the consolidated revenue fund and then divvy it up the way they see fit.

I see that the Treasurer is now not only going to be the Treasurer, but is going to be the Chair of the Treasury Board as well. That is changing the name of Management Board to Treasury Board and taking some power away from the new Minister of Health and the Chair of Management Board. They are taking many of the powers away from her, contrary to what some of the predictions were over here.

We did not expect, on this side of the House, that there would be indiscriminate slashing of the budget. But the Treasurer, when he says he is establishing a Treasury Board—though he will not admit it and I do not expect him to admit it—concedes that he and the Chair of Management Board were not as effective as they might have been in scrutinizing and examining carefully every proposed expenditure that there might be for the ministers.

In fact, I stated—the Treasurer will say with some exaggeration; I would not agree with that—that he simply opened the vault and allowed the ministers to reach in and grab as much as they could. Those members who have not been in the cabinet may not recognize this. They can keep trying to get in there, and I am sure a lot of people will have those ambitions. But they would not recognize that every minister comes in looking for as much money as possible to create new programs, to expand present programs, to increase staff and to build capital projects. In some cases, those are very good expenditures.

I can recall that when I was Minister of the Environment I wanted to get as much money as possible, and the Treasurer used to scrutinize carefully, as did the Chair of Management Board, those particular requests and then give a 22% increase. But it did not mean that in other cases they were not tougher in terms of looking at things. They looked at their priorities and said, "Here's what we must do."

I suspect that did not happen this time. I suspect that the Treasurer did not look as carefully as he might. As I said, he does not want indiscriminate slashing. That is not productive. I agree with the Treasurer when he says that is not a productive way of dealing with the recession. But I happen to know, having sat for five years, three months and four days on the Management Board of Cabinet, that in fact that is a very important function.

1530

I do not think the government has faced the reality yet, but it will this fiscal year, to understand that it has to be very careful in assessing those potential expenditures. Perhaps the implementation of a Treasury Board will have that effect. Time will tell.

I saw a figure which I think is true, because I saw it in our material, which says that the borrowing will be \$1,000 for every man, woman and child in this province to finance

this deficit, and it will be \$3,500 by 1994-95 because of the projected increases that the government has at that time. I am going to suggest that people from around North America are not going to be looking with much favour on those kinds of continued deficits.

The Treasurer was not here and I want to reiterate it while he is here: I do not think that realistically he could be looking for a balanced budget next year. Nobody could say that. This year naturally he would have to have an increased deficit. But I implore the Treasurer that he and his government will have that kind of flexibility to designate the funds where they are most productive in stimulating the economy and achieving the policy goals and that they take that kind of careful look at each of the ministries that I suspect has not been taken in this particular year.

I want to look at effects on certain industries as well. The Treasurer is here now and this bears repetition because he comes from a part of the province that provides some natural resources and the processing and extraction of those natural resources.

When the automotive industry is booming, industry in Sudbury, my old home town, the place where I was born, tends to do better. Inco is doing better, Falconbridge is doing better, and there is more employment there. There has been an attempt, with some success, to diversify. This government made some contribution to it, the federal government and others. This new government no doubt will attempt to provide those kinds of opportunities as well, we would hope.

But when the auto industry is down, the ore industry and the processing of ore is down, the steel industry in Hamilton, which is nearby, and in Welland, which is nearby, tends to go into a recession as well. Not that it is the only product that goes into an automobile—in fact it is a diminishing product because a lot more plastics are used today—but it is still important, and when we see taxes in that area, we know that it is not going to be very helpful to that industry.

We mentioned the trucking industry. The Treasurer has discovered, as has the Minister of Transportation and others in the government, that there are no simple problems and no simple solutions. But one does not compound the problems or increase the problems for an industry by increasing taxes.

One of the factors in competition between our truckers and the US truckers—and those who have been involved in the trucking industry in one way or another in this House will understand this perhaps better than others—is that this competition is tough and that as soon as you put additional taxes on Ontario truckers you are going to find that they become even less competitive, less able to compete.

It is not so much that I expected that somehow the Treasurer of this province and other ministers would wave a magic wand and solve the problem. I did not expect that. But I also did not expect that they would make the problem worse for those who are attempting to compete in this particular time in which we find ourselves.

I look at the issue of cross-border shopping as it relates to that. I live in an area which is close to the border. It used to be that when I visited St Catharines—when I lived in

Sudbury I used to visit St Catharines—not all that many people went, as we say, “over the river.” The same thing would be in Windsor and perhaps in Sault Ste Marie. They talk about “going over the river,” because the river is what separates our two countries. What we are finding now are tremendously long lineups at the border.

On Sunday of this past week I had to speak in Lewiston at the Presbyterian church. I was talking about some environmental issues. It was called “A Cross-Border Dialogue.” One of the things I had even forgotten about, despite watching on television the long lineups that existed there, was that when you go over the border, the lineup is not so long. When you try to find out how you are going to get back, and the member for Niagara Falls would know this—she does not cross the river to shop, I know that—she could see across the river the long lineups of people coming back.

Hon Mr Laughren: I have seen you cross the border with an empty tank.

Mr Bradley: Always with a full tank. Anyway, I went to the Presbyterian church to speak. Those people there, I think, recognized the problem as they came back over the border and realized that a lot of their fellow citizens in adjacent communities are going there.

There was a time when it was the people in Sault Ste Marie, perhaps in Cornwall, perhaps in Port Colborne and Fort Erie and Niagara Falls, who went across the river to do their shopping. Today people are coming from far greater distances. You have now got an influx, what I would call an outflux, I guess, or an exit, from Hamilton, Kitchener, Oakville and Mississauga, places like that, of people who are heading to the border to do their shopping.

There are about three loss leaders that attract them over there. One is the cost of gasoline, and people will go over to fill up their gas tanks. A second is the cost of cigarettes and alcoholic beverages, and they will go over there to purchase those products. There are some other products as well.

One of the points I made in my question to the Treasurer earlier today was that it is not simply somebody going over to buy a case of beer, although I understand that a case of beer is much cheaper in the United States than it is in Canada—that is what my colleagues who live in the peninsula tell me—but it is the fact that it makes meal prices cheaper on the American side, so the restaurants that are on the American side are able to offer meals at considerably less than on the Canadian side. A lot of that is based on the fact that the cost of the alcoholic beverage, the bottle of wine or another drink that one might be having with a meal, is somewhat lower.

What we have seen in this budget is an increase in taxes on all those items. I am the first to be fair with the Treasurer and say I do not expect that he has got all the answers to a complicated problem. But again, what he has done, in my view and I think the view of the mayor of St Catharines—I heard him on the radio this morning—is make the problem worse with those kinds of tax increases. I would hope that in reconsidering he might withdraw

those taxes, though I suspect that is not on his mind at the present time.

I want to look at the problems confronted by families who are facing unemployment. We have in our community, as there are in many communities, an unemployed help centre which is funded by the Ontario government. The president of the local labour council, Gabe MacNally, who has always been an activist on behalf of working people in St Catharines, wrote a letter to the Minister of Labour and to MPPs from the Niagara Peninsula outlining the position of the labour council on that and looking for some additional funding. He was surprised that, first of all, our local labour council was not apprised of the fact that there might be more money available, and second, it was not designated as receiving some of that funding.

The reason I raise this issue is because during times of deep recession, during times of high unemployment, people go to unemployed help centres almost in desperation to get counselling, to get assistance, just to get some moral support at a time when it is very difficult for them and their families. It is not always pleasant at home when father or mother is unemployed or perhaps both are unemployed and the kids come home from school and it has been a tough day. They have been out looking for work and there are not jobs there and they have got to face that reality. From time to time family violence results from this, whether it is in terms of a husband-and-wife confrontation or whether it is the children who receive the kind of treatment they should not receive because the people are at their wits' end in dealing with the unemployment circumstances.

1540

What we are seeing today, and I quoted this in the House previously, is what Gord Wilson had to say when he visited St Catharines. This is an interesting figure that I see a lot of people are picking up on, and I give him credit for coming forward with this. It is that the people who are losing their jobs today are losing them permanently at the rate of 48%. Back in the recession of 1981, 1982, 1983, about 27%, somewhere around there, of the people who lost their job were not going to get it back; that job was disappearing for good. That has changed now. It is 48%. It is much tougher for those who are facing those circumstances to contemplate that when they know there is not going to be a return to a job.

My voice is going to improve perhaps with this excellent glass of Toronto water, which of course is perfect water, no doubt, now that the NDP is in power. At least I have not heard anything about it being—

Mrs Marland: It was perfect when you were there.

Mr Bradley: It was perfect when I was there, said the member for Mississauga South very kindly.

A couple of other items I want to dwell on. One is Elliot Lake. Again, being from Sudbury originally and having relatives up there, I know the great difficulties facing the people of Elliot Lake. Many of those people have already had to travel from job to job. They have been in the ore extraction industry and, when tough times come, they often have to move somewhere else. When you are in southern Ontario, oftentimes you can get a job in an adja-

cent community or even in your own community. The economy is diversified sufficiently that you can find other employment. If you get into a place like Elliot Lake, it just cannot be done.

I could multiply that by many across the north, where people in largely single-industry towns and cities and villages face the prospect of having to lift the whole family up and move perhaps hundreds of miles away or to go to another area where there is mining taking place. Very often the people who are working in those industries are suited to those industries—they have the skills for those industries—and cannot easily move to another job where some substantially different skills are required.

I know that the older members—I should not say the older members—the long-serving members of the NDP who served in opposition will be somewhat forgiving of those of us on the opposition side today if we recall promises, because we recall that members such as the member for Nickel Belt, who was vociferous and vocal in his criticism of previous governments, Liberal and Conservative, and justifiably so from his point of view, would expect that we would remind the government of the promise in Elliot Lake: the promise that in fact employment would be maintained because Ontario Hydro would be directed to purchase in the province of Ontario its product to operate its nuclear generating stations.

There was an understanding. It has been there since years ago. A legislative committee looked into the pricing of that particular product many years ago, I recall. The Conservative government of the day decided that it would allow Ontario Hydro, or perhaps even encourage Ontario Hydro, to purchase its product right here in Ontario and generate employment.

What we are seeing now is a situation where these people are being left aside, where the promise of the government is falling by the wayside, where the same speeches that the NDP members made in opposition are changing considerably today as they talk about the realities of office. Once again the public sees that the NDP is like other parties, not worse than other people. Some would say perhaps in a partisan sense that the New Democrats are awful, they are a pack of socialists, they do not care about this and that. I do not say that. I simply say that the NDP in office is similar to Conservative governments and Liberal governments in that it recognizes when it gets into office that there are certain realities and it has to make some tough choices. They made a choice in this case to allow heavy unemployment in Elliot Lake by not directing that the uranium purchased by Ontario Hydro for the nuclear generating stations should come from Elliot Lake. The people in that area will suffer for that.

Again, I got a letter from people in my local labour council whose advice I have valued over the years, whether in government or in opposition previously and today, and have acted upon, in many cases, the suggestions that they have made to me. I had letters from some of those people imploring that all members of the Legislature do what they could to ensure that the people of Elliot Lake would be allowed to have their jobs continue, that the purchases would take place. Unfortunately, I am going to

have to write back to them and inform them that the NDP government is not prepared to see that happen, as I would have to if they had written to me about Varity Corp which the now Premier said in opposition should never be allowed to go to the US, or Consumers' Gas. Again, a lot of people out there who looked at the NDP—I even was convinced at one time, sitting on the government side, that the NDP was close to perfect. They always seemed to have this air of morality about them, and I think where it comes from—

Mr Nixon: Pseudo-morality.

Mr Bradley: Pseudo-morality, says the interim leader of the Liberal Party, but I must say they were effective in conveying the viewpoint to me that they were somehow substantially different from others in politics, and I find out that they are not. That is disappointing. It is like finding out that something you believed in—I cannot say this because I do not want little kids to find this out—really does not exist.

Mr Nixon: It's disappointing.

Mr Bradley: It is disappointing for me. I always used to look for the NDP to be on the cutting edge of certain issues as well, and I find out that when it gets in public office it is not, and I miss that. I would say there are probably some people in the New Democratic Party who wish they could have been in opposition for ever, because they could be pure for ever. They could be seen to be assisting governments by prodding them into action.

I know that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, the member for Elgin, who voted for the tax increase for tobacco, is a person I like. I happen to like that member. I think he has a great personality in terms of dealing with the members in the House, and he has a tough job. What I really feel today is that the Treasurer has cut off his legs at his knees because he said to him—that is what the Premier once said about me, for some reason, he said somebody did that. But I am saying the Treasurer has done that to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, because he is working hard out there. He is working hard to attract people to the province of Ontario, and yet the Treasurer of this province raises gasoline taxes and other taxes and discourages people from coming to the province of Ontario. So there is all the work the Minister of Tourism and Recreation does, staying up to 2 and 3 in the morning, no doubt, developing new plans, going around the province of Ontario encouraging people to be upbeat about tourism. What happens? The Treasurer turns around and takes money out of his pocket. I feel badly for him.

The former Minister of Tourism and Recreation—the member for Quinte was that at one time—would understand that very well, because he knows that he is going to have fewer visitors in eastern Ontario as a result.

There are some areas where the minister did not produce, as well. He has not cured unemployment. In St Catharines it is 14.1%. In Windsor it is a little over 14%—it is even higher than that. He would say, "Well, it's only eight months now since we've been in office, so how can they expect anything?" I think people were expecting a little more than they got so far. He will tell us to be patient as he

should, but people on unemployment insurance cannot be patient.

I am going to go back to education, because I have many friends in education, and I was a teacher. In my previous incarnation I was a teacher and a member of the teachers' union; in fact, on the executive of the teachers' union. Some of my colleagues thought I was very militant in those days, back when teachers were getting 1% and 2% increases in their pay, and indeed I was militant at that time.

1550

One of the things I was always aiming for: One of the reasons I got into politics, of course, was because of the member for Brant-Haldimand and his encouragement back in 1967 to get into politics. He was working at that time on having the province assume 80% of the cost of education and I thought, "Gee, that sounds like a good idea." We worked hard at it, certainly, and found that it was difficult to achieve.

If you put together the payments into the teachers' superannuation fund, and if you put together all the other possible things you could throw into the pot last year, for instance, you could say the province was supporting education to the tune of about 57% or 58%. But, of course, that is not what the NDP said it was going to do. It was going to raise its share of the cost of education to 60%.

What happened? As I saw in the Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation update—this is the elementary school men teachers' federation—the government has in fact lowered its percentage of the cost of education that it was paying in the province of Ontario. It has actually gone down.

This will be disappointing to some of the members who were elected on the government side of the House who campaigned so hard on this issue. They now have to go back to their local federations and explain why it is going down and why it is unlikely to be increased to that 60% because of some of the other commitments this government happens to have in the field of spending.

One thing the Treasurer did do, which I think is worthy of some praise, was to continue the Liberal program of providing new capital funds for elementary and secondary schools in this province. He has said he is going to extend that program of \$300 million a year for another year, and I think that will be helpful. A lot has taken place in terms of construction in the past five years and I am sure that will be welcome to them. They will say: "This is a good policy on your part. It is nice to see you continuing to implement those Liberal policies."

I am happy to see that the Treasurer is continuing the Environmental Youth Corps that was established by this government to give young people in the province of Ontario a chance to participate in improving the environment while at the same time being able to earn some money. This is exceedingly important to those of us who sit on this side.

When the Treasurer was spending money, when he was looking at all the money he had to spend and deciding what his priorities would be out of the money he had available, I would have hoped that he would have put a tremendous

amount of money into sewer and water projects. He will say he put some significant sums in.

I remember a letter I received from the Treasurer—I think I mentioned this in the House once before—where he said, “Why don’t you start acting like an Environment minister and put your money where your mouth is?” That was pretty plain English coming from the now Treasurer to the then Environment minister, because he wanted something in his riding, and understandably so. I can understand that. I wrote back a letter saying that we were doing the best we could—does that not sound familiar, “doing the best we could”?—and that in the framework of fiscal responsibility, and where the needs were the greatest for the environment, we would be channelling that money.

The Treasurer had a chance—and he still has a chance—in the middle of a recession to channel a tremendous amount of money into water and sewer projects. First of all, the rules have been made tougher. I saw in the *St Catharines Standard* where one of the engineers from the regional municipality of Niagara was stating—I will not say lamenting—the fact that the rules and regulations governing sewage treatment plants are much tougher now than they were a few years ago. I deliberately did that, and I knew it would cost more money for the province of Ontario for that to happen. What is required now is a genuine upgrade of those sewage treatment plants to meet those new requirements, and that means the province has to pay its fair share.

The member for Welland-Thorold was present on an occasion when we were involved in opening a new sewage treatment plant. Indeed, he informed me that he had worked in this particular plant at one time as a student and asked on that occasion that I indicate some strong support for and recognition of the people who were working in the plant. I thought that a most appropriate suggestion on his part. He was delighted on that occasion that we were having an improvement to that sewage treatment plant. I cannot speak for him, but I am sure he would be pleased to see this government, if it is going to spend its capital funding, spending it on improving those plants because they must meet our environmental objectives. At the same time, as the Federation of Canadian Municipalities said, they have a tremendous economic impact on our communities in terms of job creation. Much of that job creation comes from the private sector.

What we have in the province, however, facing us today, instead of these kinds of what I consider smart ways of spending money—our agricultural critic, the member for Cornwall, suggested one way today that we could spend money smartly to assist farmers who are having a difficult time staying on the land, even though those of us who live in urban areas would like to preserve agricultural land. He suggested there should be some increased assistance designated for farmers. I think most people who are fairminded in this House would say that should be the case.

I am looking in this budget, when I go through it, for one single measure that would turn the economy around, instil confidence, attract new investment, new jobs, and retrain displaced workers. I heard a lot about retraining and

some potential announcements forthcoming. I think one of the areas where, if we are to be competitive, we have to be involved, is very extensive retraining of members of our workforce.

When I started out as a kid and then as a student going into the workforce, I assumed that the job I had would likely be the one I would have for a lifetime, unless of course I got elected to public office. I suspect most people my age would have felt that. Today, people going into the workforce recognize that in fact they are going to have many different jobs. To be able to do so and be competitive in that job market, they are going to have to be retrained. That is where I think this government has failed in one specific area to put sufficient direction and funding, into that field of retraining which would be a productive expenditure, not only in the short term, but in the long term.

I notice that the government did something, again that business people recognize probably better than I, with the small-business tax. You can say, “Well, we’re going to get the person who has been”—I would use the word “successful”; the government would say the person who has generated a lot of profit—“by nailing them with a change in that tax structure.” I go back to the point that when you do it, the workers ultimately are going to suffer from it. Yes, that person may lose some profit. That person may decide to move his or her money somewhere else. That person can do that, but it is not as easy to move one’s job somewhere else. So I would like to see that kind of retraining and training and skills development money expended in this province.

The Treasurer announced job creation of some 70,000 due to this budget. Indeed, the Treasurer claimed this was his reason for running such a high deficit. I think an objective examination of those figures would say that they will not hold up to careful scrutiny, that in fact the generation of 70,000 jobs is simply found only in the budget document itself, and that it cannot be so. It is the result of what we call the macroeconomic model, based on estimating the number of jobs that can be created when X number of dollars is spent. However, that money must be spent on direct job creation for the figure to be valid. In each of these cases the money is going to almost everything but job creation, so we are unlikely to see even those 70,000 jobs that the Treasurer suggested are actually being created.

The government is introducing a \$57-million manufacture recovery program, which will offer loans and loan guarantees to small- and medium-sized manufacturers that happen to be in difficulty due to the recession. That covers an awful lot of them. This is estimated to preserve—not create new—6,000 jobs. I commend the government on this specific measure which, though it is not a major step, is a modest step that can be helpful.

1600

But I think we have to really look at what circumstances we are facing in the province. The new economic outlook for this government is much grimmer than it might have anticipated when it took office. Ontario will continue to suffer a recession that is twice as bad as in the rest of the

country, and that is a fact that a lot of people have not taken into consideration.

One of the reasons obviously is we are the major industrial province and industries are hit hard. That means the government has to have policies which are specifically designed to turn this economy around. The economy is expected to decline by 3.3% in 1991, with another 184,000 jobs lost. The Canadian economy is expected to decline by only 1.6%, so people around us are doing better than we are.

Unemployment is estimated to average 10% in 1991-92 and decrease very slowly to 7.8% by 1994-95; this with a government in power which says it was always in favour of full employment. Inflation is estimated to increase from 4.8% in 1990 to 5.6% in 1991. Consumer spending is estimated to decline by 1.5%. I should note here, however, in the long term the Treasurer's estimates—I think it was about 4% that he said inflation was going to be, or perhaps even less than 4%—are quite optimistic when we look at the fact that this deficit will have an effect on interest rates and costs in this province.

Housing starts are expected to fall from 93,000 in 1989 and 62,000 in 1990 to about 46,000 in 1991. Real business machinery and equipment investment is expected to decline by 4.3% in 1991, while real business non-residential construction is expected to fall by 9.1% in 1991. Ontario exports—and we know how much we rely on our exports in this province—will plummet by almost 8% this year, compared to 2.2% growth in 1990. I wish we had the market here to say we are self-sufficient. There would be different kinds of policies we could develop. We have to export, however, and we have to be competitive to export, and we also face some North American conditions, to be fair. But that is a fact of life: They are going to decline by 8%.

The government is putting forward extremely optimistic and doubtful projections for growth of the economy of 3.4% in 1992, 4% in 1993 and 3.6% in 1994. Now, if you included inflation, you might say that, but I think if you exclude inflation, the real growth will simply not be that. Based on this optimistic outlook, the government is also projecting an average growth of 9.8% in tax revenues over the next four years. If these projections are off, Ontario will live with a \$10-billion-plus deficit throughout the Premier's regime.

Now one of two things is going to happen to meet those revenue increases in a percentage term. Either the economy is going to grow and the government is going to get that money—and it might have grown, by the way, if it had cut some taxes instead of increasing them—or it is going to face the other consequence: It is going to have to raise taxes again. Again, it will be tough on the people of this province and tough to attract people who want to invest money in the province of Ontario.

The manufacturing workforce has decreased by about 10% in 1990 and that is pretty well attributable to the inflation. I will not attribute that to the new government's policies or people scared of it. That was a fact of the recession and the problem is, it is continuing to dwindle. The construction workforce has been cut by one third. The service sector is now being adversely affected.

The seasonally adjusted unemployment in Ontario was 9.9% in March of this year, compared to 6.4% in September. In March 1991, Ontario had a seasonally adjusted total of 520,000 unemployed people. The unadjusted total was 569,000. When the NDP took power, unadjusted unemployment figures were at 316,000. This is an increase of 79% in six months, pretty grim for the province of Ontario. The prescription provided by the Treasurer, while it may in part have some effect on alleviating that—I do not want to cast it out and say it is a totally useless document; that would be unfair, unrealistic and untrue—is not going to address that problem sufficiently for the working people in this province and, more important at this point in time, for the unemployed in this province who want to work, who want to be productive members of our society but are left without that opportunity.

I mentioned earlier the problem of the scarcity of skilled people in certain jobs. I could be wrong on this one, but I used to think of General Motors in St Catharines. They talked about tool and die makers and other people with specialized skills and they talked about their average age being somewhere around 55 years old. These people, if they had 30-and-out, would be able to retire after 30 years in General Motors. Many chose to stay on. I am not convinced we have necessarily all those kinds of skilled people available today, and yet there are going to be opportunities for them at some time in the future. That is why I want the government to address that problem.

Youth unemployment has increased rather drastically over this period of time. They are going to face the same challenges as everybody else as we go into the future. It is very discouraging as they come out of school when they do not have a job to go to and they do not have an opportunity. It means when they are talking to their friends that they will tell their friends that all the education they got was for naught.

One of the most telling figures is the duration of unemployment now. Again, people used to be able to hop from job to job from time to time. The member for Brantford is here today. I remember my father at one time, when he was unemployed in St Catharines during one of the recessionary periods, had to go to Brantford to work. He had to work from 12 to 8, which were not very pleasant hours to have to work, or 11 to 7, one of the two. I think it was 12 to 8 in his particular case.

People could go from place to place in the province of Ontario because there might have been jobs in an adjacent community. The member for Brantford and the member for Brant-Haldimand, who are both here, know of the difficulty that community has faced over a number of years with unemployment. I guess many communities are facing that now and people do not have that chance to go back to jobs.

I mention the telling statistic: In 1982, 21.5% of all layoffs of over 50 people were due to complete plant closures, and today that is 48%, as Gord Wilson had told us some time ago. At the same time, there were even more companies on the brink of trouble, with 1,921 Ontario firms accessing federal wage subsidy programs in January, compared to only 314 a year ago.

Bankruptcy statistics continue to soar. Ontario registered 78% more bankruptcies in March 1991 than in March 1990, for a total of 2,455. From January 1991 to March 1991, 1,015 businesses went bankrupt in Ontario; 77 of those were manufacturers, and 24 manufacturers went bankrupt in March 1991 alone. It is a pretty grim picture because it is the people who own the businesses themselves who are affected and it is the people who supply them and supply services and products to them who are affected, and of course it is the workers in those particular operations who are badly impacted by this.

I wish that things were somewhat different, but they are not, and we find that the solution the NDP has is to raise 11 different taxes by some \$1 billion, fully annualized over the first full year. Only one tax for those living below the poverty line was reduced, and I am pleased that in fact the Treasurer has taken that upon himself; that is, for low-income people. He has followed the lead of the previous Treasurer of this province in reducing and enriching a program which meant that low-income people in certain categories would not have to pay taxes. It is good because it puts money back in the hands of those people to make expenditures that are required. When he follows the lead of the previous Treasurer in matters of that kind, he cannot go wrong.

1610

But here he is in other matters where he is wrong. Gasoline taxes are going up 1.7 cents a litre to 13 cents a litre for unleaded gas and 16 cents a litre for leaded gas immediately. On 1 January 1992 the gasoline tax will go up another 1.7 cents a litre. This is a 30% increase on the unleaded gasoline in less than eight months. Revenues to the province will increase by \$205 million as a result in 1991-92; \$410 million over a full year.

It is a tax grab. The government will disguise it as something else. We know how those disguises work. We know how the government does those things and now it is doing it, as other governments have. It is involved in a tax grab.

There is a difference now. We are in the midst of a recession. That is not the time to be involved in a tax grab. When the economy is booming, the government has the opportunity to adjust upward some of the taxes it has.

Hon Mr Laughren: What would you have done?

Mr Bradley: The Treasurer says, "What would you have done?" I would not have raised taxes in the province of Ontario.

Treasury officials estimate that an average Ontario driver will pay \$88 more a year in gasoline taxes and northern drivers, some of the people who elected the Treasurer, \$110 more, based on greater distances.

Diesel taxes have gone up 1.7 cents a litre, with an increase of 55 cents a litre on railway locomotive diesel tax. I can remember the NDP members—the member for Renfrew North will remember this—when they stood in this House to try to encourage the federal government to retain rail service. Now what do they do to the rail service? Do they enhance it? Do they encourage it? No, they put a tax on it. The provincial government puts a diesel tax on

the locomotives in this province. On one hand, they say, "Please save Via Rail, please save the freight services," and on the other hand, they turn around and tax them and make them less competitive. To me, that does not make a good deal of sense.

The NDP chose not to lower the threshold income level for the high-income surtax of 10% from \$84,000 to \$65,000. Rather they increased the surtax from 10% to 12% in 1991 and to 14% in 1992. This is estimated—and the Treasurer is always interested, he rubs his hands in glee when this happens—to raise \$60 million in 1991-92 and \$90 million in the full year. This will affect taxpayers earning more than \$84,000 a year, which will mean members of the cabinet. I do not think anybody else in the House is affected.

Interjection.

Mr Bradley: Oh, it does not affect members of the cabinet. Oh, yes, I realize that. Here I thought it affected members of the cabinet, and it is just too low for that. I will not comment further on that. But here I was wrong. I am glad the member for Renfrew North pointed that out to me, because I did not recognize that immediately. I thought, with that very healthy stipend ministers over there have, that it would affect them, but apparently it does not because some portion of that—okay.

What else can I be critical of in this budget? Oh yes, effective 27 May 1991 the volume levy on alcohol is increased by five cents a litre to 29 cents per litre on spirits and wine. I say "spirits and wine" again because we have tried so hard to save the wine industry in this province, and what does the Treasurer do? Bang, he puts a tax on it.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food would understand this. I will not ask him to intervene in the debate, but he will understand how difficult it is to keep our grape and wine industry competitive. He must privately think in his own mind, "Isn't it awful what the Treasurer has done to the wine industry in this province by increasing that tax?" And beer—they have put up the price of beer again.

Ms S. Murdock: How many times did you increase it?

Mr Bradley: Not only did this government let the beer companies raise the price—I happen to know that has to go through cabinet. A lot of people in this province do not know, and I would venture to say that even the person in the chair today may not be aware, that the cabinet must approve all increases in the beer price; not just the taxes but beer increases have to be approved by cabinet.

All the working people out in this province who enjoy the odd beer here and there, in the Golden Pheasant Tavern in St Catharines or the Mansion House Tavern or any of these places in any of our communities, who enjoy the odd ale are going to find out that the Treasurer of this province and his colleagues in cabinet approve all those increases in the price of beer. Then on top of that, after they have approved the price—notice I say after they have approved the price increase—they put a tax on top of that, a tax on an increase. I certainly believe that this is not proper at all. I know the Speaker who is in the chair, who is formerly

from St Catharines, would very likely agree with me if she had the opportunity to do so.

There are other tax increases that I want to go through. Oh, I like this one from this angle on it. I was trying to figure out, with the premiums for—everybody's but mine, I must say—car insurance going down in the province, this government must have said, "This is not very good, because if premiums are coming down under the present program where the private sector is providing car insurance in this industry, people will say: 'Why would the government intervene? Why would the government now want to set up a government-run insurance scheme?'" To do that, they put the tax back on, and they know that of course will be reflected in the premiums. The premiums will go up and then the government will say: "See, we told you the private sector is increasing the cost of insurance. We need government insurance."

That is something that perhaps the Treasurer himself did not think of, because he is an honourable gentleman, but I know many of his colleagues probably thought of that and suggested to him this might make good sense. In fact, as I read the—he is pointing in the House now. I will not say to whom. But perhaps some of the gurus who advise him and advise the public for \$800 at their seminars suggested this might be a good idea.

I am one who is reluctant to use names in the House, but I will because it is a public person. When I want to know what the government is going to do, I listen to Gerald Caplan. He is on with the other two people from the other two parties in the House. Gerald Caplan suggests what this government might do. Then I know that some would do the opposite and some would do what he suggests.

Then the next thing I do is I read Michele Landsberg in the *Toronto Star*. She gives her advice. These are people giving public advice to the NDP. I get to know then just what is going to happen in this regard.

I was trying to figure out how I could work into this speech the new appointments system, the radically new and different, unpolitical, non-patronage appointments system that the Speaker would be very aware of. This is one time she cannot respond, because she is sitting in the chair. I will fit it in because it costs money. That is how I can fit it into a budget debate.

When the member for York South was elected the Premier of Ontario, I heard him say and I heard him announce in this House, with a good deal of fanfare and with a lot of people believing him—and I have said in the past that I actually, from a politician's point of view, straight politics here, admire the fact that this government is able to convince a lot of people that its system of appointments is radically different and much more fair than existed previously. It is not; it is a sham to say that.

This is not to say that I believe this government does not have the right to appoint. We in opposition will watch and see what they are doing, and we will make comment, but they won the election. When you win the election, even if it is with some 38% or some 37% of the vote, you win. Those are the rules.

1620

Mr Cooper: With 74 members.

Mr Bradley: That is right. It elects 74 members with 38% of the vote, but those were the rules when we went into the game, and that is fair, even though I know that a lot of New Democrats who used to be in favour of proportional representation have faded into the woodwork now that they have won the other way. Those are the rules, and I believe that if they got elected by the rules that existed, they deserve to be there.

Ms S. Murdock: We used to play football, right?

Mr Bradley: The member for Sudbury was interjecting. I should say in the House that I used to live down the street from the member for Sudbury, Sharon Murdock. You are not supposed to name people, but that was her name then. Now she is the member for Sudbury. She lived at the corner of Eyre Street and Albert Street and I lived at the corner of Albert and Whittaker, and we used to even play together in St Albert's schoolyard.

Mr Nixon: Ah, God.

Mr Bradley: Football, she said.

Ms S. Murdock: You know I could beat you.

Mr Bradley: She was a better football player than I was, I must concede that.

This has sidetracked me, but anyway, she would be interested in knowing that the appointments system that the government has advertised and the appointments system that it has delivered are two different things, that there is a major gap between reality and perception. If this government said: "Look, we're going to run things the way the other people did. We won the election and we have the right to appoint New Democrats," I would say, "Sure, you're entitled to do that." If the members opposite say, "We're going to set up a committee and the committee can at least interview the people and that's a step forward," not a big step, I would say, "Okay, I'll concede that to you, that's a step forward."

But it is characterized out there, and I even read it in a column once, that somehow the committee has the right to veto, that the committee has almost unlimited access to ask questions, that it can have third parties—that is, people who have an interest in it—make comment either in writing or otherwise and that it can look at reappointments and so on. It can do none of those things. From that point of view it is a sham. I only say it is a sham because of what it is portrayed to be, not because of what it is. I am happy to be able to sit in the committee from time to time and meet some of the people whom the government is appointing. Not all of them are going to be New Democrats. They will wisely choose some high-profile Conservatives and Liberals to appoint to things, so they can say, "See, we're non-partisan." Yet the overwhelming majority of people will be New Democrats, and that's the way it is, as Walter Cronkite used to say.

That got me off my thoughts here, but I want to go back to some of those thoughts.

The corporation tax: Again, I do not have shares in corporations or anything like that. I am like most Canadians

who have any savings at all. You put them in Canada Savings Bonds and in the bank or something like that; and there is precious little there, I must say. I just filed my income tax form and it would verify that. However, there are people who are risk-takers, people who are prepared to take a chance and make a profit, who are looking and saying: "This NDP tax commission"—members opposite call it the Fair Tax Commission—"what are they going to do to me to take away any potential profits I can make? While I'm making those profits, by the way, I'm going to generate some economic activity." That is the kind of rhetoric and that is the kind of promise that is going to make people, at the very least, hesitant to invest in this province.

The government promised a packaging tax on virgin materials or selected materials like batteries to serve as a deterrent to manufacturers who package goods with unnecessary and non-recyclable packaging. I did not see that in the budget. If the government had it in the budget, it would be a tax increase. If they had offset that tax increase with a tax decrease somewhere, they could justify it, and if they would do as they said in opposition, that is, designate it for a specific area—the Treasurer will tell me what you call those kinds of funds; designated funds—in fact, one could have said they had some form of justification. Two conditions: one—

Hon Mr Laughren: I think Bradley needs a new challenge. Run for leader, Jim. Come on.

Mr Bradley: I am encouraged by the Treasurer to run for leader.

Mr Nixon: Did he announce?

Mr Bradley: I have not announced that.

Mr Bisson: A whole bunch of people around you are turning white.

Mr Bradley: I am a member of the moderate middle in this province. Where was I? Oh, yes, designated taxes.

Mr Nixon: There's only one thing that would make him announce.

Mr Bradley: There is only one thing that would probably draw me into the race, and I will not say what that is.

Mr Nixon: That's if I were to announce.

Mr Bradley: Someone suggested it would be the announcement that the interim leader was going to run, but they are just jesting; it would not really be the case at all.

Anyway, had the Treasurer come forward with the kind of tax with two conditions—one, designate the funds in a specific area and, two, have an offsetting tax decrease—he would not have heard opposition from people in this party to that. I think he will do that, probably, in a further budget. He can remind me on that occasion, if the circumstances are as I have described them, that we said we would not oppose such a tax under those circumstances. But it did not appear. Instead, he certainly hit the people on other taxes that are rather important.

Where does this take us as we go into 1991 and 1992 in various ministries? The Minister of Energy would want to encourage conservation as much as possible, and she has some new money for that. She should be delighted about that. I hope she uses it wisely to encourage conservation,

because that is a major plank in the NDP government's platform of energy in the province; I will not say the provision of energy, but energy in the province of Ontario. I wish her well. I think she would need more money than has been indicated for those purposes if she is going to meet her goal of avoiding having to build new generating capacity, but I hope that money, used wisely, will encourage and educate people to be more energy efficient.

Somebody made fun of the now Minister of Financial Institutions when he suggested that everybody should get a free fridge; some people in opposition even made fun of it. Well, the concept is not out of line. It may be that the specific proposal was not on target, but it generated some interest and I think it really points to the fact that our appliances in our homes should be much more efficient. I think the government of Ontario, through Ontario Hydro, could actually pay industry to convert its machines to more energy-efficient machines, and therefore diminish at least, if not eliminate, the need for new generating capacity, because all of us recognize that there is no benign way of producing electricity in Ontario or anywhere else.

We have nuclear generating stations. We have had safe and efficient generating stations so far. People have concerns about what you might do with the waste, and people are working on that problem. Some people express concern about that way of producing electricity, even though it is our major way of producing it now and Canada has established a good reputation in that field. Others have expressed concern about fossil fuel plants, because they contribute to global warming and cause pollution in terms of sulphur dioxide and NO_x emissions.

A third group—I remember appearing before the House of Commons committee on acid rain. A member from Quebec irritated me for some period of time. He asked, "Why do you call it Ontario Hydro?" He kept emphasizing the word "Hydro" because he wanted to make the point that we burn coal in this province. Well, we do burn coal, and it does produce emissions which are not good for the environment, and we are working on those. When he continued to press the question, I put it to him that if Ontario wanted to flood its native people out of their homeland and wanted to leach mercury into their waterways, I guess we could call it Ontario Hydro. He had no further questions.

1630

The point is, there is no benign way of producing electrical power, which is why the conservation efforts of the government will be so important. This is not to suggest that there will not be a need for some capacity. That will be determined by the Environmental Assessment Board, looking at the arguments put forward with a good deal of objectivity, and if it is needed, those individual projects will be put before the Environmental Assessment Board to determine if the adverse environmental effects can be overcome, and that is as it should be. But the portion of the increase, even though in percentage it is great, given to the Minister of Energy to carry out her responsibilities is rather meagre, in my view.

There are 6,000 medium and small businesses in Ontario, and this is where I get into this tax. They move to

eliminate exemptions for insurance premiums, and that is going to raise insurance premiums. They are going to cap the mining tax exemptions, at the very time when people in northern Ontario are struggling to get more activity in the mining area—I think that is going to be a step backwards—and they claw back exemptions for 6,000 small and medium businesses in Ontario. For a full list of taxes, I could provide for them yet another series of comments, but I will not do that.

Again, small businesses, just because they are successful, should not be taxed out of business. Do not just look at those who are unsuccessful as being worthy of some support, or at least benign neglect in terms of not taxing them. Look at some of the successful people in the province and allow them to generate jobs.

The current cost allowance, which provides tax incentives for the purchase of new manufacturing equipment, will be phased out 1 January of next year. It will remain for pollution control equipment. That is good. I think that it should apply equally for process changes, not just the abatement equipment itself.

But what happens when they take out this cost allowance at a time when we are in a recession is they may have the satisfaction of saying: "We just got the corporate sector. We just showed them. We're not going to give them breaks." But who ultimately benefits or does not benefit from it? It is the working people of this province. What we have to get back to is, what is the effect for the general population—as Ed Broadbent used to say, the average Canadian—when we do those—

An hon member: The ordinary Canadian.

Mr Bradley: The ordinary Canadian, as he referred to them.

There is \$1 billion in the technology fund set up by David Peterson, and it had its allocation actually reduced this year from \$132 million to \$131 million. This fund is crucial to aiding in technology transfers, startups and research and development and was needed in this budget more than ever. I would have thought that it would have been a good idea to advance those funds even further.

I was talking to the CBC in Sudbury today, for instance. They asked me about some of the effects on northern Ontario. Really, only the northern members experience on an ongoing basis the different circumstances up there. When I lived in Sudbury, I remember, for instance, the difference between the south and the north.

An hon member: How long ago was that?

Mr Bradley: Many, many years ago now.

The member for Essex-Kent would know—he has similar land to what I have, I guess, in the peninsula—that all you do when you want to put in a sewer in your area is get the backhoe out. In Sudbury they are blasting all the time. It is an additional cost. So every time you can keep the cost down—

I was up in Timmins in March, and in Sudbury, not on a political visit in this case, but looking at the old communities. I was actually watching basketball at the time. St Catharines teams were playing in both Timmins and Sudbury and I went to see them in action.

You really get an idea of what the road system is like. We in southern Ontario drive on four-lane roads. You go into northern Ontario and there are not many places where there are four lanes, and you really see that the promise that the government made for those four lanes is a promise which has not been kept. I see that the four-lane highway, the \$100 million per year in the north, are two important things that should have happened up there.

I listen to some people in southern Ontario who say: "Don't the northern Ontario people always cry about things? Aren't they always saying this or that?" They have to understand that those people live in different circumstances. Some of the members in the House on all sides are from northern Ontario. The members from the east understand some special problems there. We cannot have programs which are geared in blankets to the whole province without modifying them to satisfy certain parts of the province.

Now the Agenda for People, I noticed, because I looked carefully—tell me if I am wrong; someone in the opposition will—was not mentioned in the budget. Is that correct? I did not see it. I kept looking for it and said: "It's got to be there somewhere. I just haven't had a chance to look at it." It is not even there.

The Ontario tax system, to go back to that and how important it is for the whole province, does rely on certain breaks in the system or incentives in the system to get investment. We built a corporate tax system which placed less reliance on fixed taxes that are payable regardless of profitability. This was designed intentionally to make Ontario a more attractive place to invest, and those who need that investment recognize that importance. Our tax system in Ontario is also designed to provide tax-based incentives where appropriate, rather than lower corporate rates across the board. This provides the necessary incentives for new investment and new development. The government had a tool for that.

Ontario is currently experiencing competitive disadvantages, frankly, as are other Canadian provinces and the northern United States—the northern US understands this as well—from the southern US, Mexico and other newly industrializing countries with low labour costs, low taxation and few regulatory guidelines. Some American jurisdictions, and indeed other provinces such as Quebec and New Brunswick, are now offering tax holidays and other government incentives to Ontario manufacturers to locate in their locales.

It is nice to say, "On principle, we're opposed to that," but what it really does is put you out of the ball game. It does not allow you to participate as others did. You can say it is a bidding war. You can say what you want. I go back to the point that in this province we are living in a world of reality and not in a Utopia and it is important that we always remember that when we are bringing forward a budget of this kind.

I could mention many other items that are of importance to my colleagues. They will get a chance to do so. Our critic for Colleges and Universities, the member for Nepean, is here today, and he has raised some issues about tuition, the fact that tuition went up 8% this year, again in a

recessionary period of time. He has expressed the needs for good education, for retraining and proper funding of that.

The member for Fort William is here. She has served in government and knows of many of the problems that exist in the north. She will be looking carefully, she would have scoured this budget for items that would be of particular importance to the north and would have had to find a magnifying glass to find those items which would be particularly advantageous to the north, despite the fact that we have six ministers from the north. We would have thought that would have been translated into action.

Interjections.

Mr Bradley: And nothing for the east. The member for Ottawa South says there is nothing for the east as well.

When we have all of this collection, when we have a budget—as I look for my final amendment to the budget—I think the resolution put forward by the Treasurer should be amended to show nonconfidence in the government, nonconfidence because it has produced a document which, first, extracts \$1 billion out of the Ontario economy in the middle of a difficult recession and, second, which has a \$10-billion deficit this year, unprecedented in this province, one third of the federal deficit, un contemplated by any reasonable person in this community, and that has failed to address the pressing problems in the province of Ontario, problems it said it would address in its Agenda for

People and subsequent to that; a government which is not encouraging but discouraging investment through its policies, not in a deliberate sense but is discouraging it; a government which is encouraging people through its policies to leave Ontario, to take the jobs to other jurisdictions; a government which is discouraging people from placing any new funds in any long-term investments in this province which would be beneficial to working people in Ontario.

When I see a budget like this presented, the first opportunity a socialist government has had in Ontario to show what it is all about, it comes forward with a document which is sadly lacking in addressing the problems of the province.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs Haslam): Mr Bradley moves that the resolution moved by the Treasurer on 29 April “that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government,” be amended by deleting the words following the words “that this House” and adding thereto the following:

“recognizing that the 1991 budget fails to fulfil the promises made by the New Democratic Party during and following the election campaign of 1990, and that the 1991 budget does nothing to encourage investment and create jobs in Ontario;

“Therefore, believes that this government lacks the confidence of the House.”

The House adjourned at 1644.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathyssen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward

Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull

Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathyssen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve

Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson

Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson

Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood

Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer

Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathyssen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger

Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland

Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 30 April 1991

Members' statements

Garbage disposal	1063
Mr Brown	
Post-secondary education	1063
Mrs Cunningham	
John Eakins	1063
Mr Drainville	
Environmental protection	1063
Mrs Sullivan	
Government spending	1064
Mr Stockwell	
Volunteers	1064
Mr Martin	
Nursing staff	1064
Mr McGuinty	
Purchase of uranium	1064
Mr Jordan	
Raymond Kane	1064
Mr Abel	

Oral questions

Budget	1065
Mr Bradley	
Mr Laughren	
Tax increase	1066
Mr Bradley	
Mr Laughren	
Anti-recession program	1067
Mr Harris	
Mr Laughren	
Gasoline prices	1068
Mr Harris	
Mr Laughren	
Assistance to farmers	1069
Mr Cleary	
Mr Laughren	
Corss-border shopping	1070
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Native self-policing	1070
Mrs Mathysen	
Mr Farnan	
Purchase of uranium	1071
Mr Brown	
Miss Martel	

Assistance to farmers	1072
Mr Villeneuve	
Mr Laughren	
Mrs Haslam	
Mr Buchanan	
Income tax	1072
Mr Nixon	
Mr Laughren	

Motion

Private members' public business	1072
Miss Martel	
Agreed to	1072

Petitions

Purchase of uranium	1072
Mr Brown	
Mr Ramsay	
Automobile insurance	1073
Mr Cooper	
Taxation	1073
Mr Sorbara	

Government business

Budget debate	1076
Mr Bradley	1076
Adjourned	1088

Other business

Visitor	1065
Mr Malkowski	
Visitor	1073
The Speaker	
Question period	1073
Mr Cousens	
Adjournment	1088

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1089
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1089



26 1991

26 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 1 May 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 1 mai 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Wednesday 1 May 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

REPORT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table a report of the Honourable Gregory T. Evans, commissioner on conflict of interest, regarding the Honourable Zanana Akande, Minister of Community and Social Services.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ASSISTANCE TO LEARNING DISABLED

Mr Callahan: I rise today to speak to many of the ministers of this House: Health, Correctional Services, the Attorney General, the Premier, the minister for the disabled. I want to relate a few facts to them.

Do they realize that learning disabilities is one of the seven most disabling conditions in Canada, that 85% of young offenders show symptoms of learning disabilities, that 50% of young suicides suffered from learning disabilities, that 50% of criminals are learning disabled, that 16% of Canadian children have learning disabilities, that up to 80% of referrals to outpatient psychiatric clinics for children turn out to be handicapped readers, that between 30% and 50% of all basic adult learners have some form of learning disability?

There are 64,000 persons in the region of Peel who are learning disabled.

I am not asking those ministries to spend more money. I am suggesting that they use it more wisely in looking into this problem. Perhaps they can correct the problems that will arise in the future, if they are not looked at. I suggest to them that in my years of practising criminal law, in many of the cases when I rose to speak to sentence, the pre-sentence report started out like this: "The young person had a learning disability which went undiagnosed. As a result of it, they were pushed on from class to class, lost interest in themselves and eventually wound up being people out there in the criminal process."

GREATER TORONTO AREA

Mrs Marland: When the NDP government unleashed its irresponsible budget on the people of Ontario, it argued that tripling the deficit to almost \$10 billion was necessary to help solve some of the province's social problems.

Let's take a look at how well that will work in the greater Toronto area. Twenty-eight million dollars is being pledged for expanded recycling programs. Metro council's works committee chairperson, Joan King, told the Toronto Star that is a drop in the bucket. She says it is impossible to finance new initiatives to reduce, reuse and recycle with so little money.

While the GTA carries about 35% of the provincial welfare load, Metro's commissioner of community and social services, Don Richmond, says his department will get

only \$5 million of the \$125 million earmarked for welfare spending. He points out that Metro welfare costs have jumped \$60 million in the past year. So the NDP claim that the higher deficit is justified in the name of social benefits is simply hogwash.

Not only does the GTA not receive the kind of help it needs, the new fuel taxes imposed by the New Democrats will cost the area \$850,000 this year and \$2.3 million in 1992.

Just like everyone else in the province, residents of the greater Toronto area will pay the price of the NDP's monster deficit and get precious little in return.

MAY DAY

Mr White: May Day, 1 May, has long been marked as a celebratory day for labour activists.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the very progressive accomplishments of a modern union local. CUPE Local 1000 represents the employees of Ontario Hydro.

After the previous government gutted the worker health and safety bill, it introduced into its next collective agreement the right for its members to refuse unsafe work. This should be particularly commended, given the number of workplace accidents and deaths that we mourned on 28 April, the national day of mourning.

CUPE 1000 also has a comprehensive employment equity plan that would enhance the representation of women and minorities in Hydro's employ.

This union local is also involved with environmental and conservation groups in developing new strategies to meet the energy needs of our provincial economy. They are profoundly concerned about any environmental contamination and state clearly that nuclear plants should be upgraded to achieve zero environmental emissions.

I feel that such progressive unions and such progressive moves should be commended, particularly today on May Day.

NORTHERN TRANSPORTATION

Mr Brown: On the same day as the NDP pulled the plug on Elliot Lake, the NDP thinks it can pull the wool over the eyes of the people in northern Ontario.

On the one hand, the NDP is eliminating the charge to northerners of a vehicle registration fee, a saving of \$33. On the other hand, the gas tax increase will mean an average \$110 a year in added costs to northern residents. That means that the registration fee will leave \$33 in each northern driver's pocket for about two seconds, and then the other hand will reach in and take out \$110.

My friends in northern Ontario, the NDP will give the north \$15 million and take away \$50 million. Do the Treasurer and the northern members of the government caucus believe that this is going to play?

It is unbelievable that higher costs to northern drivers have been delivered by this government, a government that

campaigned on the platform of controlling gas price gouging and giving northerners a break. It was the Minister of Northern Development's literature which stated, "Gas prices must be equalized across the province." All I can say is she got it half right. The increase is equal across the province but the prices are still higher in northern Ontario.

The quality of northern roads, our climate and our distances combine to dictate the purchase of larger vehicles in northern Ontario. Four-wheel-drive vehicles and sports utility vehicles are going to have tax increases. The real reason the northern Ontario four-laning highway projects are not going ahead is because no one will be able to afford to drive on them.

1340

NORTHERN HEALTH TRAVEL GRANTS

Mr Eves: Speaking of getting things half right, I refer to page 10 of the Treasurer's budget, introduced in this House two days ago. He indicated that there was good news, at least for the constituents in Parry Sound riding in the districts of Parry Sound and Nipissing, in that he was reducing the minimum distance for the northern health travel grant program to 100 kilometres for travel one way within northern Ontario or Manitoba. I want to emphasize the word "within," because it is very important in this discussion.

I then contacted the Minister of Health's office both on the afternoon of the budget and yesterday afternoon, only to have explained to me that as far as the Minister of Health's office was concerned, it knew of no change in the northern health travel grant program.

I then contacted the Treasurer's office yesterday afternoon and was informed that what I suspected was correct, that it did not address the other part of the northern health travel grant program. They have not changed the distance of 300 kilometres for travel from northern Ontario to southern Ontario for specialized treatment, ie, in the city of Toronto, where many constituents from the district of Parry Sound and the southern part of the district of Nipissing have to come for specialized treatment. Those people will not be helped at all by the Treasurer's grandiose announcement on page 10 of his budget.

I would ask the Treasurer and the Minister of Health to reconsider their positions in this matter.

HUGH EDIGHOFFER

Mrs Haslam: I rise in this House to honour a former Speaker of the Legislature, whose portrait is to be unveiled today.

Hugh Edighoffer is one of five generations of Edighoffers who have lived in Mitchell in my riding of Perth since his grandfather settled and opened a department store on the main street in 1924. He was first elected as a provincial member in 1967 by a majority, I am told, of 184 votes. Ten years later, however, he was elected with the largest plurality of any rural riding and again in 1985 with the largest majority of any candidate in the provincial election.

He was appointed as Speaker in 1985 and always tried to serve in a fair, impartial but firm manner. Mr Edighoffer is widely respected for his unbiased judgement, calm manner

and his informal yet not heavy-handed style. He was well respected by the members and was described by many people as one of the most non-partisan politicians at Queen's Park. He is now a country gentleman in a town of approximately 1,200. I am told that he promised 15 years ago to clean out the basement and that he hoped to get time to do it now.

Today we are unveiling his portrait as the former Speaker and I know all members join me in showing appreciation to Mr Edighoffer and wishing him good health in his retirement.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr Miclash: This is the type of letter that members of this government can expect to soon receive from tourist operators across Ontario.

This letter is an example of what can be expected from a tourist operator running a fly-in operation in the north.

"Dear Mr Minister,

"I have tried to understand you, but I sometimes feel that this government just doesn't want us in this business.

"Your budget that came down this week is the last straw. It sure is tough to build up a loyal clientele of returning customers when they think I am robbing them at every turn. All I can say is, when I tell them it is all the taxes you people have piled on us, they stop yelling at me, but they start saying some pretty unpleasant things about you.

"The tax on gas for the car to get them here is bad enough, but then I have to pass along the tax from the gasoline for the outboard motor, the diesel for the generator and the aviation fuel to fly them in to my operations. They sure aren't happy about the increase in the liquor prices, and they cannot believe what the new tax on my four-by-four means to my bottom line. They sure ain't happy campers. I think more and more of my guests are going to find alternatives south of the border.

"Mr Minister, as a fly-in operator, this budget is causing a lot of turbulence in our industry and my final words to you are, 'Mayday, mayday, mayday.'"

BUDGET

Mr Turnbull: The budget was indeed a historic document. Not only is it the first socialist budget in Ontario's history, but it has produced a deficit of historic proportions. It took 124 years to give us a debt load of almost \$39 billion. The socialist government will manage to double this amount in only four years.

The Treasurer has predicted that Ontario will begin to come out of the recession this year. Yet, as my graph shows, the massive deficits are to continue each year for at least the next four years. Our children's future is being mortgaged to pay for the lack of control today. A baby born in Ontario before this budget was born owing \$4,000 as its share of the debt; after four years of socialism an Ontario baby will start life \$8,000 in debt. What a gift for our new citizens.

Not only is our Treasurer out of sync with the collective wisdom of every other treasurer in all of Canada, both federal and provincial, but his lack of control on our

money has threatened our credit rating. The Premier spoke of the hocus-pocus of the triple A rating, calling it a monkey on our backs. Should our credit rating drop, this monkey will cost us an additional \$15 million of interest charges in 1991-92 alone.

My constituents work hard for their money. They demand their government have more respect for it.

MAY DAY

Mr G. Wilson: May Day is an ancient holiday celebrating the arrival of spring. More recently it has been associated with the celebration by workers in many parts of the world of their achievements in creating more just and humane social conditions. The international solidarity of workers is particularly important at a time when multinational companies, aided and abetted by neo-conservative governments, are pushing a concept of competitiveness that will worsen conditions for workers in both the developed and the developing countries.

I am pleased to say that the celebration of May Day is enjoying a revival in Ontario. Mayworks, a festival of working people and the arts, is thriving in its sixth year in Toronto. Mayworks in Windsor has activities running from 27 April to 5 May. In my riding, May Day, a workers' festival, is making its first appearance. Tonight there will be lectures on working-class experiences in Kingston, Canada and abroad. Friday will feature films on working-class themes. Saturday night at the Steelworkers' Hall, Kevin Head and David Archibald will play music appropriate for May Day.

In the words of its brochure, Mayworks emphasizes that art should belong to everyone, not just the élite, and that art can mirror the concerns and crises of society. In these difficult economic times, when the labour movement and the arts are both under attack, it is only natural that we support one another.

I would like to add that by building solidarity among workers everywhere, we can create a world that is truly worth celebrating.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before continuing, members may wish to welcome to our midst this afternoon the former member for Scarborough Centre, Bill Davis, seated in the members' gallery, west side.

PORTRAIT OF FORMER SPEAKER

The Speaker: I also would like to invite all members of the Assembly to the unveiling of the portrait of the former Speaker, Hugh Edighoffer. The unveiling will take place in the main foyer of the grand staircase at 6 o'clock this evening.

In the past, the proceedings of the unveiling ceremony have been recorded by Hansard. Would it be the wish of the House to include this as an appendix to Hansard?

Agreed to.

[See appendix, page 1115.]

1350

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

ASSISTANCE TO BUSINESS

Hon Mr Pilkey: It gives me great pleasure to present to the House the details of two important budget initiatives that will be managed by the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology.

In his budget on Monday, the Treasurer presented a comprehensive plan to assist the people of Ontario during the process of economic recovery. My ministry, including the Ontario Development Corp and Innovation Ontario Corp, will play a vital role in this process. As the Treasurer said, "Government alone cannot create sustainable prosperity, but it can start providing the framework and stimulate strategic investment, both public and private, that will be needed to achieve it."

There are some small and medium-sized manufacturing firms in Ontario which are fundamentally viable, but which are having financial difficulties because of the recession and high interest rates. These firms provide quality jobs with solid future prospects and have long-run strategic value to our economy. This government has promised to support Ontario's small and medium-sized businesses, and now we are delivering on that promise. My ministry has designed programs aimed at those businesses that need assistance now and that can best be expected to lead the recovery once this recession is over.

The manufacturing recovery program is a \$57-million financial assistance package to help fundamentally sound, small and medium-sized manufacturing companies recover from the recession. It is estimated that these targeted companies employ some 25,000 people. It is my ministry's intention to support the recovery of these firms that might otherwise succumb to the current economic difficulties. This program is designed to inject confidence and provide support for a vital but often neglected sector of the economy and to ensure that we do not lose sight of our commitment to technological change as a guiding force in the Ontario economy.

The manufacturing recovery program is open to manufacturing companies in Ontario, foreign-owned or domestic, that consider this province their home base, that is, companies whose key decisions are directed from Ontario. If these companies have been unable to market their products because of the economic downturn here and in our major markets, then we will work with these companies to assist them in reclaiming their share of the market. If they have been unable to generate the cash to invest in new technologies and new equipment upon which their survival will depend, this new program will give them the funds to proceed. It is here that we foresee the best return on investment and the most promise for success.

We expect that up to 200 companies will benefit from the program, companies that normally employ between 50 and 500 workers and with annual sales volume of between \$5 million and \$75 million. This program will recognize the rather special needs of the north, where firms with as few as 10 employees will also be eligible.

Interested companies are encouraged to contact my ministry's small business hotline. All applications must be made prior to the end of the current fiscal year, which will end 31 March 1992.

The program consists of three elements: a recovery plan based on an expert assessment; financial assistance to hire management, technical or marketing personnel, and loans and loan guarantees where identified and seen as necessary in the recovery plan. Further, investment in our technological infrastructure, the network of people and institutions that gives us technological capability, is important to Ontario's future success.

But the problem of acquiring access to capital for high-technology firms has become even worse in this particular economic climate. Private sector capital is moving farther away from the small startup operations and seeking more stable, larger companies with a proven track record. This is a rather critical concern to our ministry.

Over the past five years, Innovation Ontario has worked closely with 177 high-technology firms in Ontario. This MITT agency has provided computer hardware and software, telecommunications, environmental protection and energy conservation firms with investment seed capital to grow and to expand. Usually Innovation Ontario works with companies that are too small to attract the bigger venture capital firms.

This fiscal year we will double Innovation Ontario's budget to almost \$22 million. This program will allow the government to invest in promising technology firms as well as allow greater funding options for early-stage companies, and it will allow for the provision of financial services not currently available to these types of companies. In addition, we expect this funding increase will enable Innovation Ontario to become a key instrument in this government's long-range strategy of shifting our economic base to higher value added, technology-oriented production.

The programs I have talked about today build on a long list of MITT services offered to our manufacturers, retailers and service sectors.

Finally, allow me to conclude my statement by repeating our commitment to work as partners with the business community and with labour. It is only through such partnerships that we will be able to create sustainable prosperity and the high value added products and services that will move Ontario to a healthier and more productive economy.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Hon Ms Akande: This government is announcing some first steps towards the revitalization of social assistance reform in Ontario. This announcement concerns employment, job creation and back-to-work initiatives and is part of the \$215 million announced in the budget by the provincial Treasurer. These measures re-establish and reactivate the plan to reform the social assistance system.

In 1986 the Ontario government established an independent committee, the Social Assistance Review Committee, SARC, to undertake a public review of the province's social assistance system. In 1988, SARC produced a comprehensive report known as *Transitions*,

which reflected the input of individuals and community groups province-wide.

In May 1990, the Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation was created. This community-based group, chaired by Allan Moscovitch, was charged with transforming the many recommendations contained in *Transitions* into new legislation. Last October, we asked this group to fast-track its important work. I asked for recommendations that would be of significant benefit to people, recommendations that could be implemented without changing the legislation. In March of this year, the advisory group's report, *Back on Track*, was released.

We believe this initiative will put social assistance reform back on track after the previous government allowed the momentum for reform to dissipate. I would like to provide further details as to how some of that money will be spent.

The first step I am announcing today will demonstrate that this government is committed to helping social assistance recipients find employment and reduce their dependency on social assistance. Of the \$215 million announced in Monday's budget, we are allocating \$48.8 million to back-to-work initiatives. They include full recognition of child care costs in calculating net earnings, continued general welfare assistance eligibility for persons working full time but still in financial need and an increase in the percentage of earnings, from 20% to 25%, that recipients of general welfare and family benefits can keep.

As well, we will establish opportunity planning pilot projects in a number of communities. Opportunity planning is fundamental to the vision of a reformed social assistance system, as highlighted in the *Back on Track* report. These pilot projects will be designed to help some social assistance recipients develop personal plans to help them find employment. Others will be helped to find the community supports and services that will reduce their dependency on social assistance.

In addition to our \$215-million response to *Back on Track*, we have established a \$30.5-million job creation fund, with new money, for this fiscal year. This fund is expected to create at least 1,700 jobs for people who are receiving social assistance. This new funding for job creation is in addition to the \$23.9 million announced early in March.

We believe that people would rather work than receive social assistance. This new fund will create opportunities in the broader public sector to give social assistance recipients new skills and work experience.

This announcement of job creation and opportunity planning is only the first step. Today I have accounted for about \$49 million of the \$215 million announced by the Treasurer on Monday; tomorrow I will explain how we will use the remainder of that annual funding.

Today I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of my Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation, and its chair, Allan Moscovitch, who I am pleased to note is with us today in the Legislature. Without their hard work and dedication, this progress towards social assistance reform would not have been possible.

Members may rest assured that the important process of social assistance reform is indeed back on track.

1400

RESPONSES

ASSISTANCE TO BUSINESS

Mr Kwinter: I listened with interest to the statement by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Even if it were accurate, I would be critical. But it is obvious that the minister has no idea what is going on in his ministry, because what we have today is a total rehash of programs that have been in place for the last couple of years. We already have a technical personnel program. We have the Ontario Development Corp, the Northern Ontario Development Corp and the Eastern Ontario Development Corp. What we have now is a program that claims to be spending new money for new programs.

Let me tell members that the budget that was just presented negatively affects 6,000 small businessmen. The 70,000 so-called jobs which are going to be maintained or created—the key word is “maintained,” which means there is no guarantee that one new job will be created—is going to take up 43 days of a year. What is the government going to do about the other 320 days, where more jobs are going to be lost at the rate of something like 1,500 jobs per day?

I know the minister will go out into the scrum and say, “That’s ridiculous; we’re putting new money.” If we look at the budget, and this is a budget that shows a 13.4% increase in expenditure, on the line that says “Industry, Trade and Technology,” it is \$192 million last year and \$192 million this year. When we consider that inflation is in there, the ministry is spending less money this year than it did last year. Instead of rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic, why does the minister not get out there and fight for some money and do something to save some jobs in this province.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mrs McLeod: This week of disbelief just keeps going on and on. We have an announcement today from the Minister of Community and Social Services regarding one of the only tangible commitments that was made in that budget, and yet we have almost nothing here in this announcement.

There are very few details. There is no indication here of the planning that would be needed for immediate implementation. I would point to the opportunity planning portion of this announcement, which is something we have been calling for repeatedly in this House, and yet there are no criteria here for establishing a program, and no indication of where the program might be offered, in spite of the fact that this is exactly the same program that was recommended in the Back on Track report.

The announcement about job creation is even more perplexing, both in terms of the funding and just what is intended. The minister may be aware that in the last budget of the past government there was a \$54-million allocation. That \$54 million, to the best of our knowledge, has not yet been allocated, unless in fact it is part of the \$215-million announcement which was made in the budget, which in

reality is \$158 million in terms of its impact in this particular year.

That money was intended to be for job readiness programs, programs that would help people who are currently unemployed to be ready to go into the productive workforce. It was never intended to be a job creation fund. Surely the Ministry of Community and Social Services has enough pressures and enough to do to meet the social policy needs, to meet the real needs of the unemployed people, to help them get back to work, that it does not also have to take on the responsibilities for creating the jobs for unemployed people to go back into.

It concerns me that if the Ministry of Community and Social Services is now becoming a job creation ministry, it can only be because there is a total absence of any long-term planning for economic renewal or job creation on the part of any other ministry in this government, and I think the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Technology announcement today is an indication of that.

If in fact the \$54 million from the past budget is not part of the \$158 million in this current budget announcement, we would look for some indications in the future announcements of how that money will be allocated and what priorities will be set. We would assume that tomorrow the minister will announce \$12 million for municipal assistance for those municipalities where the number of people on social assistance exceeds 3.5% of the population, whereas currently 90% funding is given where the number of people on social assistance is greater than 4%. That is a tragic indication of just how many unemployed people there are in communities across this province.

Nevertheless, we have also advocated municipal assistance at a greater level, and we will welcome that announcement from the minister tomorrow. We would question why this particular announcement has even been broken up. We wonder whether this raises a question of whether there really is any integrated planning, any comprehensive programming, or whether we are just scattering water where the fires are hottest.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

DÉCLARATIONS MINISTÉRIELLES

M. Grandmaitre : Monsieur le Président, j’invoque le Règlement. J’ai mentionné auparavant que les déclarations ministérielles qui sont faites en cette Chambre sont très importantes et je dois féliciter la ministre des Services sociaux et communautaires qui nous a procuré une copie en français.

Par contre, je déplore que le ministre de l’Industrie, du Commerce et de la Technologie, qui a fait une annonce substantielle en Chambre, n’a distribué aucune copie en français. Il existe en Chambre non seulement une pratique ou une politique, nous avons une loi en Ontario qui gère ces déclarations-là. J’espère que le ministre de l’Industrie, du Commerce et de la Technologie en prendra note aujourd’hui.

The Speaker: To the member for Ottawa East, I sincerely appreciate his point of order. In our standing orders there is not an obligation, but it is a matter of courtesy. I take it that your remarks have been received by the

government ministers, and perhaps the courtesies will be extended further.

ASSISTANCE TO BUSINESS

Mr Sterling: I would like to respond to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. There are three ways that the minister can help business out and attract investment to Ontario in the long run.

The first is to keep taxes at a competitive level. Ontario has the highest taxes in all of North America, and as a result of Monday's budget we can look forward to even higher taxes. Second, we can keep regulations and red tape to a minimum. This government is bent on increasing red tape regulation for businesses to encourage them—ha, ha—to invest in Ontario. Third, they can build the proper infrastructure for business to operate in the province of Ontario. The Treasurer's budget on Monday increased, in a percentage proportion, the amount spent on social services and the part relating to building infrastructure shrunk once again.

The people of Ontario are angry about this government's budget. They are tired of governments spending more than they take in. They are outraged at the tripling of the deficit in this budget. They are tired of governments spending their money to buy off special interest groups.

The leader of the third party helped elect that government on the basis of the spendthrift Liberals in the past government. When is this government going to learn its lesson? Why does it not return this money to the taxpayers or reduce its deficit, spend properly? This is not a correct expenditure of the taxpayers' money in this province. This program is a disgrace. Quit buying off the people of Ontario. They no longer will take it from this government.

1410

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Jackson: I would like to publicly acknowledge the hard work and efforts of Allan Moscovitch and his group, the Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation, and the predecessor work of George Thomson and the Transitions report.

I would like to say that the persons most affected by the minister's announcement today are perhaps the most eloquent spokespersons for what they think of the minister's announcements today. I quote from the Toronto Star a headline, "New Funds Fall Short, Poverty Groups Say." Here is what the groups directly affected are saying about this announcement today. "'We expected so much more and we're terribly, terribly disappointed,' said Gerard Kennedy, executive co-ordinator of the Daily Bread Food Bank." Metro chairman Alan Tonks and Toronto Mayor Art Eggleton both "said the NDP program was lopsided and doomed to fail." FoodShare executive director Richard Yampolsky "accused the NDP of 'backsliding' on pledges made to get it elected.... 'This is a zero-sum budget for the poor.'"

They are saying that because they realize the government can assist them with day care costs, it can put more dollars in their pockets, but what they want is the dignity of a job. That is what Ontario residents want, and until this

government realizes that it has to create an environment in order for there to be work, these paper announcements of the minister will fall short of expectations.

The government has committed \$30 million for training, I want to advise the Premier, who is listening. The federal government transferred, in January and in March of this year, \$36 million for technology development just from the drug-related technology field alone. It was a fund of \$100 million. Ontario got the largest portion, \$36 million. Where did that money go? Into general revenues. We could have put that money into universities, as they did in Saskatchewan. We could have put that money into the heritage fund for the future of the people for job training, as they did in Alberta. But no, this government has to put it in general revenues so it can expand the civil service. These people are not going to get civil service jobs. These people need meaningful jobs that are not temporary but in fact give them long-term employment.

If this government was serious, it would look at other options. How can the poor get a few dollars extra in their pockets now to deal with the Treasurer's new increases? With all the taxes that he has brought in, do members think the poor have been insulated from that? There are many things that could be done. The members opposite should read the Transitions report. I could not agree more with the poverty groups in this province that say the government fell short.

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS

Hon Mr Laughren: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Yesterday, in response to a question from the member for S-D-G & East Grenville, I gave an answer which I think at least needs clarification, if not correction.

The question was how the Ministry of Agriculture and Food can have new spending of \$90 million in 1991-92 when the difference between the ministry's 1990-91 interim spending and its 1991-92 budget plan is only \$21 million. The reason for this is that in 1990-91 there were one-time expenditures that related to the farm income assistance program.

In the spring of 1990, the federal government announced a \$500-million, one-year farm assistance program for grain, oilseed, horticulture and fur producers in Canada. OMAF was able to secure \$54.6 million of this funding by using Ontario's \$48-million interest rate assistance program to lever the federal money. This interest rate assistance program was also a one-year-only program.

Thus the 1991-92 budget plan for the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food reflects the reduction of \$103 million for the 1990-91 farm income assistance program. With the 1991-92 new program initiatives of the gross revenue insurance plan, with which the member I know is very familiar, of \$40 million, and the farm interest assistance of \$50 million and the ongoing program adjustments of \$34 million added, the 1991-92 budget plan of \$576 million is reached.

In summary, \$103 million was taken out of the allocation and \$124 million was added to the allocation, resulting in a difference of \$21 million. I appreciate the attention of the member in listening to my response.

ORAL QUESTIONS

TAX INCREASES

Mr Kwinter: I have a question for the member for Oshawa, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. The minister has been caught napping again by the devastating budget presented by his government. The NDP, which has come to stand for 'Nother Dumb Policy, has introduced a tax on Canadian families and auto workers which will heavily penalize consumers who drive family-size vehicles and thousands of auto workers who make them, and this at a time when GM, Ford and, as recently as today, Chrysler have announced that they have had the largest deficits in their history for the first quarter, the largest losses in their history.

Will the minister share with the House the consultations he and the Treasurer have had with the auto manufacturing industry and, more important, the representations that he had made to the Treasurer on behalf of the auto industry in the runup to the budget?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I would be pleased to respond, but I am going to defer to the Treasurer, since it is his budget recommendation.

Hon Mr Laughren: I think that the member for Wilson Heights would appreciate the fact that when this government came to office, one of the major planks in our platform was that we were going to be an environmentally conscious government and we were going to put a lot of emphasis on conservation of energy. I think that the member for Wilson Heights, to be fair—and he sits right behind the former Minister of the Environment—would appreciate the fact that it is important to send a message to consumers and to the industry that when cars are purchased, conservation and the environment should be considerations in that purchase decision.

Mr Kwinter: I really feel it is sad when there is a question that is addressing the major sector in our manufacturing sector, one that impacts on virtually everybody in Ontario and is the one thing that makes us really economically different from any other province in Canada, the automotive industry, and the man who has cabinet responsibility for it cannot stand up and answer that question which has nothing to do with how they dealt with the budget but has to do with the jobs that are on the line.

We have a situation here where the president of Ford Motor Co and the president of General Motors, both of whom I spoke to today, are literally beside themselves because they had no consultation. The minister has never talked to them about it. There are jobs that are going to be on the line, and when the Treasurer talks about the environment and when he talks about efficiency, he should know that the minister lives in Oshawa, just down the street from where General Motors makes the Chevy Lumina, which is the most efficient automobile of its class.

The Speaker: And the supplementary?

Mr Kwinter: They make the Buick Regal, which is the most efficient automobile in its class. In Ingersoll they make—

The Speaker: The member for Wilson Heights, would you please quickly get to the interrogative part?

Mr Kwinter: The largest sector in our economy is saying that this particular tax is going to devastate it, it is not going to do one thing for the environment, and I want to know what the Treasurer is going to do to save those jobs in Windsor, St Thomas, Ingersoll, Oakville, Oshawa and the other parts makers in Ontario that are going to be impacted by this ridiculous tax.

Mr Carr: Those jobs are on your head. It's a direct result of you, Floyd. No jobs in Oakville.

The Speaker: The member for Oakville South, all of us I know are conscious of the efforts to get as many questions in as possible and your co-operation would be helpful.

1420

Hon Mr Laughren: As part of my response to the member for Wilson Heights, I cannot resist the temptation to comment to him that I find it very difficult to accept interjections from a member of the Conservative Party whose federal party cut \$100 million out of the Canadian Jobs Strategy.

I hope that whenever this government makes any kind of attempt or a move for environmental enhancement in this province that the member for Wilson Heights will not be on his feet in opposition to it.

Interjections.

Mr Kwinter: Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: The member for Wilson Heights, my observation of this first five minutes is that if we continue this way, it may be necessary for us to take a little recess, because we are not making any progress in terms of giving members an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr Kwinter: Mr Speaker, here is an honourable man. He is a man whom I have a great deal of respect for, and I have to take it that he believes what he says. But if you take a look at the facts, he is saying that the whole purpose of this is environmental when experts have said that 10% of the automobiles are responsible for 50% of the pollution and those 10% are old cars and cars that are not properly tuned.

What he is really doing is sacrificing the jobs of Ontarians, the economy of this province, for some symbolic gesture. All he is really doing is catering to some symbolism that is not going to do anything other than destroy the economic base of this province. How can he stand there and say, "This is why I am doing it"?

Hon Mr Laughren: There is nothing symbolic on the part of this government in its determination to protect the environment and conserve energy, nothing symbolic about that whatsoever. I would remind the member for Wilson Heights to put this in perspective. South of the border the gas-guzzler tax had already been doubled. It is not as though we suddenly decided that we were going to be out in front of everybody else in terms of the tax on gas-guzzling automobiles.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Elston: I have a question for the Premier. The Premier now has the report of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner in respect to his minister. The contents of the report are very clear indeed. Will he now outline for the House what actions he intends to take?

Hon Mr Rae: The member has stated that the contents of the report are very clear. The report states, and I have had an opportunity to read it obviously, that the minister "indicates that she wished to sever her relationship with the organization"—this is referring to Earthtone Women's Magazine—"and I am satisfied that she will take the necessary legal and administrative procedures to achieve that purpose."

It states further on page 9 that, while she was in violation of section 8(1)(c) of the act:

"I am satisfied that her default was not an attempt to avoid the provisions of the act, but rather a failure to appreciate that the incorporation of a company and being a director of the same requires certain procedures to be followed in terminating one's association with the company."

The commissioner also says that he entirely accepts the minister's letters, which she filed with him, and her affidavit with respect to the fact that she in both cases, on 10 October 1990 and at a similar date with respect to both corporations involved, did attempt to sever her relationship, that she did so in good faith, but that because of the technicalities of the Corporations Act there was still more work to be done.

I want to say to the member that under the act the commissioner has the power to reprimand the member. He did not do so. He also has the power with respect to the issue to recommend that the member resign her seat. He did not do that in this instance. There is no reprimand coming from the commissioner with respect to the conduct of the member.

I am satisfied that the minister attempted to resign both directorships. She did so in good faith. I am also satisfied that, having met with the commissioner and having dealt with this issue, she fully intends to comply with all of his recommendations.

Mr Elston: The Premier will know that the act the commissioner was acting under and the portion that he acted under was merely to make a report, as was requested by the Premier. He knows full well that what he has done in this case is accepted the same excuse that he accepted from the Solicitor General, ie, "I didn't know." Is it the intention of the Premier to absolve all his ministers of responsibility in questions of conflict or inappropriate behaviour by accepting the excuse of ignorance of the law?

Hon Mr Rae: I will tell the member very directly what my approach is. There is no question here of a financial benefit, no question here of a challenge to the minister's integrity in terms of her conduct, no question of her desire, in terms of the letters, that she has expressed to sever any connection at all with these two organizations.

In that regard, I really think what I have to deal with as the first minister is: Did the cabinet minister do what she

thought was adequate? Yes. Is there any challenge to her integrity here at all? None at all, not an ounce, not an iota, not a jot. There is absolutely no sign of that. I am sure the minister has learned a lesson with regard to the technicalities of the acts in question, but there is absolutely no question in my regard of her having to resign from cabinet. It would be entirely excessive in terms of exactly what the report of the commissioner says and in terms of all that I know about the minister's conduct.

Mr Elston: On 3 July 1986, the member for York South, as he then was known, stood in the House and said: "What difference does it make what guidelines exist if the Premier is not prepared to do what is necessary to see that those guidelines are enforced?" What difference does it make that the Premier has talked about how tough his guidelines are? What difference does it make whatsoever about what actions his ministers take if he is prepared to accept on all occasions ignorance of the law or good intentions as an excuse for a violation of provincial statute and his very own guidelines?

Hon Mr Rae: This matter was referred to the commissioner. The commissioner has the power to recommend a reprimand, or the power to recommend; he has the authority to do that, as I understand the act. The test that I have to apply in looking at the report is, what does the commissioner in fact say?

He says, "In fairness to Ms Akande"—those are his words on page 7. How can I apply a lesser standard than that, than the standard of fairness?"—"it is obvious from the letter to her associates that she either did not appreciate" that the partnership "had in fact become by letters of patent of incorporation a separate and distinct legal entity of which she was a director and a shareholder."

This is a non-profit company that never paid her and there was no payment involved. There was no remuneration involved. There is no financial interest involved. There is not a nickel involved in terms of financial interest here, and to argue that somebody should resign because of that strikes me as entirely excessive, just excessive.

1430

Mr Sorbara: Mr Speaker, on a point of order arising from the Premier's answer: I know that the Premier would not want to mislead the House and I think he did inadvertently mislead the House when he suggested that the commissioner had the power to issue a reprimand.

I just point out to the Premier that on the first page of the report of Mr Justice Evans he says, "I have elected to conduct an informal inquiry under section 16 rather than exercise the power of a commission under parts I and II of the Public Inquiries Act." The Members' Conflict of Interest Act does point out that it is only under a public inquiry that the commissioner has the power to reprimand. I am sure the Premier would want to correct the record if he just referred to those sections.

The Speaker: It is not a point of order. It certainly is a point of difference of opinion.

BUDGET

Mr Harris: My question is to the Treasurer. I assume the Treasurer wants to come back in here and defend this budget. I will start while he is walking back, to save time.

The Treasurer will know that Ontario represents 40% of the national economy. This means that any inflation increase in this province caused by his disastrous budget will boost the cost of living across the country. In other words, if the NDP decides to sneeze, and in this case I would say it is sneezing continuously, the rest of Canada inevitably is going to catch a cold.

It is bad enough that the people of Ontario have to put up with this budget. I wonder if the Treasurer could tell us if he thinks it is fair to impose his misguided policies and the disastrous results of those on every other province across this country.

Hon Mr Laughren: I heard what Mr Mulroney and Mr Wilson said as well. It seems to me that this province and this government not only do not need, but do not intend to take the advice of the very people who put us into this mess in the first place, absolutely no intention. The federal government did not need a high deficit in Ontario to raise interest rates to unheard of levels and to keep the value of the Canadian dollar at unacceptable levels. Because we are fighting the recession at least partly because of activities of the federal government is no reason for the leader of the third party to assume that what we have to do in Ontario as a result of what the federal government has done is going to cause problems in other parts of this country.

An hon member: That's your friend Brian.

Mr Harris: I was asking about the other Premiers. They are my friends. They do live in this country, and I am concerned about keeping this country together, not driving it farther apart.

In 1988 Robin Sears, chief strategist for the NDP, said this to the Treasurer's caucus: "A Keynesian solution"—it is so passé I have trouble getting it out—"to rising unemployment and declining growth would be risky and probably short-lived, even in Ontario. We would not have the capacity to double the deficit to kickstart the economy as was done in the past in sharp recessions."

The deficit then was \$2 billion. He said we do not have the capacity to go to \$4 billion, because we would lose more permanent jobs than short-term ones would be created. Now the Treasurer believes that going to five times that deficit, \$10 billion, is somehow going to help solve our current economic problems by creating jobs. I suggest to the Treasurer that this is a scam. He knows the jobs he is going to create will be short-lived, temporary jobs. Will he admit today that the 70,000 temporary, short-term jobs his \$10-billion deficit creates is a drop in a bucket to the hundreds of thousands of permanent jobs that are going to be lost as a result of these policies?

Hon Mr Laughren: I have enormous difficulty following the logic of the leader of the third party. He seems to think that if we did not stimulate the economy, if we laid off employees in Ontario, this would somehow stimulate the private sector. He is going to have to explain that to

me. It does explain, however, why he choked on the word "Keynesian." I can appreciate why he would do that.

It really is difficult to accept advice from the leader of the third party. One of his members stands up prior to question period and says we are spending too much money, and another member, the member for Burlington South, stands up and says we are not spending enough money. I wish they would get their act together over there.

Mr Harris: I know the minister will not take my advice. I was asking him to listen to Robin Sears's advice.

Let me try one more time with the Treasurer. On page 3 of his budget—page 3 if he wants to check the program—he said this, "We have made some difficult decisions on program reallocations this year." This means money was taken away from existing programs presumably for some other purpose. Would the Treasurer tell us what programs he cut.

Hon Mr Laughren: As a matter of fact, there were a great many programs. During the process, so ably chaired by my friend and colleague the Chair of Management Board, more than \$700 million of program allocations were changed around, over \$700 million of reallocations as a result of that process.

I want to say in conclusion to the member for Nipissing that I know what he wants us to do in this province, but I believe the people of Ontario have sent us enough signals that they do not want a country based on the model envisioned by Brian Mulroney; they want a model based on our vision.

Mr Harris: My second question is to the Premier, and it has to do with this mandate the Treasurer is talking about. On 6 September, 25% of eligible voters in Ontario voted for the Premier and his party's candidates. That is not a mandate to mortgage this province's future. Fully 75% of eligible voters did not want the Bob Rae government. Even the 25% who did surely never expected the blow they were delivered on Monday. In view of the fact that this budget contains a record-setting deficit—

Interjections.

The Speaker: The member for Downsview, it would be a great courtesy if the leader of the third party were allowed to place his question without interruption.

Mr Harris: Given that the budget contains a record-setting deficit which will have implications for future generations for years and decades to come, will the Premier today commit to full public hearings on the total budget before we proceed any further?

Hon Mr Rae: We have an estimates process which is there, which involves hearings and involves discussions open to everyone. We have a budget debate which is open to everyone. We also have a statement from the Treasurer which I think is very clear, that with respect to future budgets—remembering that our preparation for this budget took place halfway through the last financial year—this next year is our opportunity to begin to change the process and begin to open it up. I think the Treasurer said very explicitly and very clearly, and he has my full support in this regard, that we do want to create a process in which

people can see the choices that are ahead of us, how difficult these choices are.

Yes, if the member has some consistent advice we would like to hear it, but just earlier I heard the member for Carleton saying we were spending too much and then I heard the member for Burlington South saying we were not spending enough. Let's get clear what the messages are over on that side. We know where we are going. Do they?

1440

Mr Harris: The member for Burlington South said they are spending in the wrong direction, the wrong way.

Monday's ill-conceived and irresponsible action on the part of the government, in our view and in the view of everybody who is calling our offices, will destroy Ontario. By the time Ontarians go to the polls in four years, we will have at least a \$75-billion debt, assuming they hit their predictions, which we do not think are achievable. Each and every individual in this province will have to bear the burden of that debt for years to come.

The Premier has said they want to be a government that represents all the people. Before he embarks on a 180-degree opposite direction to what the majority of Ontarians want him to go, would he not agree they deserve a say? I ask him again, before proceeding any farther with this nonsense, will he agree to refer the whole budget to a legislative committee to allow the public to have its say before we proceed any further with debate and budget bills and implementing this budget?

Hon Mr Rae: This will happen. This is an open forum. This is a place where discussions will take place. The estimates process is where the discussion will take place.

We have been elected as a government. I know it is hard for the member opposite to accept that fact, but that is true; that is the reality of what has happened. We are exercising that responsibility with as much care as we can, given the circumstances of the recession. I want to say to the member for Nipissing that we have made a decision as a government that we put fighting the recession as the first obligation we have. I do not think, really, that the people of Ontario are surprised that the New Democratic Party government would put fighting the recession as its first priority. I think that is what they expect of us.

Mr Harris: I cannot believe anyone has called the Premier and said, "Thanks, Bob, that's exactly what we needed."

An hon member: Bob White did.

Mr Harris: Other than Bob White and Susan Eng. I am sure she likes it too.

I doubt the taxpayers are stopping the Treasurer on the street and saying, "Gee, Floyd, you did just exactly what we'd hoped you would do." The people of this province are furious. The government is destroying permanent jobs and replacing them with temporary jobs. The people calling our offices, the people I see on the street, the people I heard on the Andy Barrie show this morning are telling us that to get out of this recession and to save Ontario's permanent jobs, governments should be spending less money and collecting fewer taxes.

The Premier does not want to listen to me, he does not want to listen to us. He refused to listen to the advice he got before the budget. Will he not allow the public to have their say by sending this whole budget to a legislative committee before we proceed with debate on this budget and before we proceed to implement this absolutely disastrous disgrace?

Hon Mr Rae: The member has indicated that he would like us, as I understand it, to refer the entire matter to a parliamentary committee. I can only tell him that the standing rules of the House call for a budget debate, a response to the budget from the opposition parties. That is coming today, as it did yesterday. There was a very vigorous debate about a number of issues and there will continue to be.

I want to say to the honourable member that there is a budget debate, there is an estimates process and, as I have said before, there is a commitment from the Treasurer for a new process with respect to a new budget in which we set out very clearly the choices that are there. That is the way we intend to proceed. We think that is the fairest way to proceed and we think that is the best possible approach we can take on behalf of the taxpayers of the province.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr Elston: I have a question for the Premier. The Premier had fun reading from the report and he also had fun telling people that Mr Justice Evans had powers he did not have. If he would read the statute, he would rise and correct the record, that Mr Evans did not have the authority to do what he said he did.

My question will relate to some of the statements made on page 7. The minister was "in violation of section 8(1)(c) of the act." On page 8, "No returns, annual or otherwise, have been filed under the provisions of the Corporations Act since June 17, 1982 in violation of the statute in that behalf." On page 9, "the minister was a director of Zarida Associates Inc when she filed her disclosure statement and was in violation of section 8(1)(c) of the act."

The Premier has tried to hide behind Mr Justice Evans. The Premier knows that he alone has been set up as the sole arbiter, sole judge and sole executioner in matters of this sort. I ask the Premier, when will he stop hiding behind other people and do his job?

Hon Mr Rae: First of all, I am not hiding behind anybody. I am just telling the member the facts of the case. I am telling him that the matter was referred to the commissioner and the commissioner has made a report. That is what I am saying. I am not denying for a moment that the commissioner, as finder of fact, has found with respect to both corporations, the Earthtone non-profit magazine and the family trust, that the minister tried to resign but that this did not take effect.

The member is asking me to be the executioner in this case. I am saying to the member that I have no intention of doing that and I am going to tell him exactly why: because I have read the report and because I have read what he says. "I am satisfied with her explanation." That is what he says on page 8 and he says on page 9, "I am satisfied that

her default was not an attempt to avoid the provisions of the act." That is the fact of the matter.

With respect to my interpretation of the act, there is no constraint under section 16 or any other section. If the commissioner had wished to make any recommendations with respect to the conduct of the minister, he could have done so.

Mr Elston: In the province of Ontario today, we have standards that were set in place by the Premier of his own will. Nobody forced him to set those standards. Nobody was assigned by the Premier to read the results of a violation of those standards or to make the final decision on those standards. He retained it unto himself. To this date he has retained it unto himself.

I am asking the Premier how he intends for the people of the province to have faith in the standards he himself has set when he allows ignorance of the law or good intentions to act as sole and sufficient defence to a violation both of a provincial statute, breaking the law, and of his own guidelines.

Hon Mr Rae: I think the member's characterization of the issues is inaccurate. I would only say to the member that of course I will be judged by the public and I will be judged by others with respect to how I exercise whatever authority is vested in me.

I am satisfied there was absolutely no intention—in fact, quite to the contrary, there was clearly the intention to resign. The clear intention was there in all cases to comply fully with the guidelines and requirements of the conflict act. That intention was fully there. Under those circumstances I am satisfied that the minister should not have to resign as a minister of the crown in this government.

1450

TAX INCREASES

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. On reading his budget, there are two very interesting reviews that I would like to bring to his attention. On page 2, on the economic outlook, the Treasurer said in his projections that real growth would be some 3.7% in his three-year fiscal plan. In his revenue projections, the Treasurer gave increases in revenues of some 10% per year for the next three years. They are right here.

Those are the Treasurer's predictions: real growth at 3.7%, revenue projections at 10%. Deloitte and Touche commented on this and their comments were very clear. I would like to ask the Treasurer to respond to these comments. They said:

"The government's three-year fiscal plan indicates a growth in revenues of almost 10% per year. Implicit in those revenue forecasts is a 3.7% growth in the economy. Therefore, the Treasurer is looking at substantial tax hikes each year in the next three years to attain those revenue projections."

Those are the Treasurer's numbers; those are his calculations. What tax hikes is he looking at? How much is he going to hike the taxes? Why does he not tell the public so they can be just as upset today as they were yesterday?

Hon Mr Laughren: I am sure the member for Etobicoke West will forgive me if I try to cope with the

problems within Ontario today and with this budget before I start writing the next one and the one after that.

I think the member for Etobicoke West does ask a fair question about the out-year numbers, though. It was very clear that those numbers are in there. It is not a normal tradition in Ontario to put those in, although there have been cases where that has happened, I gather.

Those numbers were put in there to give an indication to people who are concerned about the level of the deficit this year, and I understand that concern, to show that we do intend to make sure by a mix of the growth in the economy and new revenues and expenditure controls in the years after this one when we are out of the recession, after we have made a major commitment this year to fight the recession, that we will attack the deficit and start working it down in a very systematic, serious way.

We are committed to those numbers. We are committed to reducing the deficit by a combination of revenue and expenditure control and a growth in the economy which gives natural growth in revenues as well. It is nothing complicated.

Mr Stockwell: With all due respect to the Treasurer, that is bafflegab. The Treasurer knows that is bafflegab. When he talks about his revenue projections, revenue is revenue coming into this province; revenue is generated through increases in taxes, licences, etc.

The Treasurer's own people in his own ministry have said he is going to hike revenues by 10% per year for the next three years. Let's cut to the chase. That means simply that he has to hike taxes. He cannot deny that. The only way to increase revenues is to increase taxes. The Treasurer has a serious problem.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Stockwell: The Treasurer has a 3.7% growth in his economy and a 10% growth in revenue. He should come clean with the public. Whom is he going to hammer, how many more jobs is he going to lose and why is he going to increase taxes when no one agreed with this deficit-financed budget?

Hon Mr Laughren: The member for Etobicoke West is plain and simply wrong. He is not wrong when he reads the numbers that are in the budget statement, but he is wrong when he says they are going to continue to cost jobs.

Mr Stockwell: Come on, answer the question, Floyd.

Hon Mr Laughren: This budget, with its attack on the recession, has saved or created over 70,000 jobs and I can tell you as well, Mr Speaker, that—

Mr Stockwell: Come on, answer the question. You do not want to answer the question.

Hon Mr Laughren: I am going to have to send that man a brown paper bag pretty soon if he does not calm down. I am trying not to be provocative.

The member is simply wrong when he says the only way to increase revenues is to raise taxes. That is fundamentally wrong. We believe the growth in the economy itself will increase revenues. As well, I have never said there will not be new tax measures in the years ahead.

Why would I say something like that? But I think they will be fair taxes based on recommendations to the Fair Tax Commission.

I think the member for Etobicoke West is not painting the picture correctly when he implies that the only way to increase revenues is to increase taxes. It is simply not true.

Hon Mr Pilkey: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The member for Ottawa East raised a very bona fide question at the time of the minister's statements. I would like to advise him that the French version has now been circulated to all members of the House. We regret the delay. We also regret any inconvenience to him and other members.

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: The honourable minister should not be taking up question period time correcting the record he made with respect to a ministerial statement.

The Speaker: Earlier, during question period time or prior to it, a member raised a point of order and the point of order has been responded to. Under the orders, the clock continues to run.

WOMEN'S LEGAL CLINIC

Mr Frankford: I will try not to be provocative. I have a question for the Attorney General. Michele Landsberg reports in the 20 April edition of the Toronto Star that my colleague the member for Scarborough Centre is working to create a women's legal clinic in Scarborough. I think we all agree this would be a positive step in improving the lot of women in Scarborough and across the province. Can the Attorney General tell me whether such an application has been received by his ministry?

Hon Mr Hampton: I can tell the member that I saw the article too, but to my knowledge no application has been received in respect of such a clinic at this time.

Mr Frankford: Can the Attorney General tell the House the process by which the funding decision would be made?

Hon Mr Hampton: With respect to this question and with respect to any community legal clinic, applications are to be sent to a subcommittee of the Law Society of Upper Canada, which is called the clinic funding committee.

The fact of the matter is that the Ministry of the Attorney General provides funding to the Law Society of Upper Canada, which then puts that money into the hands of the clinic funding committee. But the clinic funding committee is not an arm of government; it operates at arm's length from the government and for good reason. Many of the community clinics get involved in litigation against the government or against agencies of the government or take the government to court with respect to social service issues, labour issues and a number of things. Any application must go to that clinic funding committee.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mrs McLeod: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. We on this side of the House are attempting to determine just what planning has gone into the budget that was presented this week and

what priorities this government has set in what is an unprecedented level of spending at an increase of 13.4%.

If we look specifically at the new funding for social assistance, we see an emphasis on assistance to municipalities and opportunity planning which we have called for and which we support. We assume the difference between the \$215-million annual cost and the \$158 million that is in this budget will have to be covered in next year's operating deficit.

We know there is also a very substantial increase in the overall cost of social assistance, but members should understand that is almost entirely for the growth in case load along with the 2% supplementary increase in rates the minister announced earlier. But we would also anticipate that there would be within the term of this budget some further increase in rates to keep pace with inflation.

I wonder if the minister could confirm, as we have learned from Treasury officials, that there is no allocation in this budget to provide for any further increase in rates in January 1992 to at least keep pace with inflation.

1500

Hon Ms Akande: Actually, the social assistance rate increase is not part of the \$215 million of which I have spoken. That referred to Back on Track. Any of those social assistance rate increases would be dealt with later on in a separate announcement, as they normally are, and not as part of this particular budget.

Mrs McLeod: I was quite well aware of that fact and indicated that in my question, that the 2% further increase in rates the minister had earlier announced was the balance of the increase in budget in social assistance, not in the \$158 million that is here. My concern was to try to establish what provision has been made for the costs that will surely have to be incurred over the course of this budget year. It gives me great concern that there has been no provision made.

I do recognize that the social assistance program is a costly one. It is particularly costly when unemployment is going up at the rate that it is across this province, and the only way you really control the costs is to get people back to work. But I think we also know, and I think in honesty we have to acknowledge, that there are concerns expressed by the public about the costs of the system and about the integrity of the system.

I think the minister herself felt compelled to write to the Financial Post to correct misinformation about rates, which indeed continue to be below the poverty line. But the concerns that we hear expressed are as much about potential abuses of the system as about the benefits that are provided.

Could I ask the minister if she could tell us how she plans to deal with potential abuses, as it is suggested in the budget that these would be addressed, so that we can ensure social assistance funding goes to those who most need it and that public confidence and therefore support for the system is restored.

Hon Ms Akande: Certainly it was a concern to us and it was recognized that many of the newspaper articles did refer to abuses in the system. One of the things we have

certainly focused on is how to address those concerns in a way that does not imply to those on the system that they are in fact presumed guilty and therefore must be focused on in a negative way.

In order to do that, we have focused on increasing the number of workers within the system and increasing the kind of contact time that those workers have so that they might be involved in counselling and the kind of support to the recipients that would focus them not only towards back-to-work initiatives, but towards the kind of support they need. This would also allow for sufficient interaction so workers would be able to identify whether in fact these people are getting the correct rates.

One of the things I want to point out is that there were as many errors in the system that caused recipients not to get a sufficient amount as there were that caused them to get more than they needed.

TAX INCREASES

Mr Stockwell: My question is to the Treasurer. Just as an aside, when he is ordering that paper bag, maybe he should get about 10 million of them, because everyone in this province is hyperventilating after this budget. Maybe he should have been in Barrie last night for the public debate with his member for Simcoe Centre, because he was hyperventilating at the same time when the public got wind of this budget.

My question is back to the original question I put to the Treasurer. His economic growth is 3.7% for the three years. His spending is 10%. He has a shortfall in there of at least \$1 billion to \$2 billion every year. He has outlined clearly that he is going to have to increase taxes. A respected firm commented on it and suggested that his taxes are going to have to go up, with massive tax hikes.

The Treasurer should explain to me how he can have a 3.7% growth in the economy and a 10% increase in revenue and still not increase the taxes. It is a very clear question. Please explain that to the people of the province.

Hon Mr Laughren: I will try again. I do not think it is the people of the province that need further explanation; I think it is the member for Etobicoke West.

I said before, and I will say it again, that we are basing those projections on the fact that during those years there will be growth in the economy. I have not seen anybody who questions the fact that they all anticipate a growth in the economy after this year. We will be able to meet the numbers in that medium-term fiscal forecast by accommodation of the growth in the economy and by serious expenditure management.

Finally, I have never, ever said to the member for Etobicoke West or to anyone else that there would not be any tax increases in the next three, four or five years. I have never said that.

Mr Stockwell: It is not just me the Treasurer has to explain it to; it includes all the employees at Deloitte and Touche who do not agree with the interpretation that he gave us today. But he did admit he is going to have to raise taxes, considerable taxes. He raised a billion dollars annually. That is significantly short of what he is going to have to raise in the next three years.

He is also going to run a deficit that is going to double the debt for the people in this province in the next four years. The federal government doubles its debt every five years. He is doing them one better; he is doubling his debt every four years. That is irresponsible budgeting in my opinion, and the people in the province think it is irresponsible as well.

He has \$1 billion to \$2 billion in tax hikes every year for the next three years on a public that does not want tax hikes. He is crucifying the border towns with gas hikes, alcohol hikes, cigarette hikes. Which items is he going to increase taxes on, and where is he going to generate the revenue? He knows full well that he is going to have tax hikes in the next three years. He should come clean with the public, because they would just like to know how he is going to gouge them in the next three years.

Hon Mr Laughren: One reason we appointed the Fair Tax Commission was to enable us to have a tax regime in this province that has more equity in it than there ever has been.

Second, I think the member for Etobicoke West surely does not expect me to tell him or anybody else at this point in time precisely what taxes will be changed or what expenditures will be reduced three or four or five years from now. I simply do not think the question makes any sense.

ASSISTED HOUSING

Mr Sutherland: My question is to the Minister of Housing. In the budget on Monday, the Treasurer announced that there would be approximately 35,000 approvals for non-profit and co-op housing this year and that approximately 13,000 units would be available for people to move into this year. I was wondering if the minister could comment on what impact he feels this will have on the working poor of this province and on the issue of people using food banks and poverty in general.

Hon Mr Cooke: I certainly appreciate the question from the member. I certainly understand why the opposition would not be asking any questions about housing these days, because this government is so committed, as was demonstrated in the budget.

The Treasurer, in his budget the other day, indicated not only that there were 35,000 units at one stage of production or another now in Ontario, but that he was committing an additional 10,000 units for a total of 45,000 housing units in this province. When you combine that with the announcement by the Minister of Community and Social Services of \$215 million in welfare reform, and you put in the additional assistance to people at low income levels being taken off the tax rolls, all of that put together, I think, is a very comprehensive approach by this government to helping people at low income levels in the province of Ontario.

1510

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Brown: I have a question for the Minister of Northern Development about the practices of cabinet ministers in the NDP government. I have a question about Elliot Lake.

Two days ago, we had a budget in this House. Two days ago, exactly simultaneously, there was a press conference in Elliot Lake cancelling the jobs of 1,100 workers. Yesterday, the Minister of Northern Development gave this House some information about uranium contracts and uranium costs which were wrong. The member for Fort William pointed that out. The minister retracted. The minister then went outside the House and gave to the media exactly the same information she had given in this House.

The minister also said that she did not know about uranium contracts. She did not know about how the costing worked because it was all secret information. She would know that in 1978 members of the NDP, including the ex-Minister of Health, heard testimony from all involved parties about those contracts, and if she had just gone down to the library, she could have checked out this little book that tells her all about the cost implications of those.

Given the fact that the minister had the historical knowledge, or should have had it, could she tell us what is different now. Why is the minister breaking her commitment to the people of Elliot Lake now, when she was so pleased to make grandiose promises before 6 September?

Hon Miss Martel: It is my understanding that in the report it says very clearly that the contracts were cost plus, that there are no figures attached as to exactly how much those contracts were worth. The point I raised yesterday in this House was that when we came to power in this province we were stunned to discover that in fact the cost, the premium at that point in time as compared to the market price, was \$1.2 billion.

As I said in this House yesterday, it would cost us well over \$500 million to continue that contract at Denison over the next 10 years. It is a price that we do not think Ontario Hydro or ourselves or the taxpayers can afford to pay. We would prefer to divert some of that money into diversification of the economy, not only in Elliot Lake but in the communities along the north shore. Once the negotiations with Rio Algom are complete, I will be more than pleased to tell this House and the public just what the commitment by Hydro to that community and the north shore will be.

Mr Brown: That is just not an acceptable response. Even the minister's friend Leo Gerard does not think that is a reasonable response.

What are the people of northern Ontario to think about the abilities and commitment the minister has displayed? She is the minister who said yesterday that her government could not afford the people of Elliot Lake. She is the minister who said—now Atikokan, listen to this—“Unemployment is higher in southern Ontario than it is in northern Ontario.” This is the minister whose city of Sudbury received \$20 million in anti-recession funds while Elliot Lake, which is going to 85% unemployment after her announcement of two days ago, has not received anywhere near that kind of money.

Can the Minister of Northern Development now tell this House what she and her cabinet colleagues have decided about the cancellation of the contracts, about the penalty money that is coming to the shareholders of Denison,

and whether the workers of Elliot Lake get any percentage of that money. Can she tell us how much of the money for cancelling those contracts the workers of Elliot Lake are going to see.

Hon Miss Martel: I want to back up a little bit and just point out to the member what our commitment has been in Elliot Lake. In December 1990, this member and I were very pleased to hold a press conference in Sudbury and announce \$15 million to the community of Elliot Lake. I should point out that that was \$5 million more than the previous government wanted to put into Elliot Lake last year—\$5 million more, my friend.

Then when we had our anti-recession money, I can also tell this House that this government put another \$2.6 million into Elliot Lake and the surrounding communities through the anti-recession fund. That was more than what the previous government was prepared to put in.

I want to repeat that we have said to the people in the community and I have said in this House that we recognize that Hydro has an obligation to the community. When the Rio negotiations are finished, we will be in a position to tell the public what that obligation will be.

COMMERCIAL CONCENTRATION TAX

Mr Harris: I was going to ask the Treasurer about a couple of the taxes. I guess I only have time to ask about one of the taxes. I wonder if the Treasurer could explain to me why a year ago he and his party vigorously opposed the introduction of the commercial concentration tax. His party voted against the introduction of the commercial concentration tax. His party pointed out, as our party did, that it would cost thousands of jobs in Toronto.

Given that those predictions are true, given that jobs are moving out of Toronto in record numbers, given that many Canadian companies are looking to Quebec, to Alberta, to Saskatchewan, to Manitoba for a cheaper place to do business because they are overtaxed in Toronto, why, when this government opposed this, when this government committed in the last campaign to do away with it, has it now left \$110 million of taxes on the commercial concentration tax in Toronto, which is costing thousands and thousands of jobs in our province?

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, I do not think that the commercial concentration tax is costing thousands and thousands of jobs. I simply do not believe that.

Second, when I first occupied the Treasury building, one of the first taxes I looked at was the commercial concentration tax because I was concerned about that as a form of taxation. But having examined that particular tax, plus all the other possible sources of revenue, given the unusual cost of providing services in the greater Toronto area, agonizing over the decision of which taxes to leave there in order to ensure that the deficit does not go any higher than it already is—which has already got the leader of the third party upset—I made the agonizing decision to leave the commercial concentration tax in place.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would like you to take under advisement the issue that I tried to

raise earlier about points of order and privilege being taken during question period. I would refer you to Beauchesne's sixth edition, page 123, paragraph 415, which says, "A question of privilege or point of order raised during the question period ought to be taken up after the question period, unless the Speaker considers it to be an extremely grave matter."

I am becoming very concerned about the fact that points of order and privilege seem to be being raised on a more routine basis during question period, thereby eating up the time of question period. I would ask you to take this matter under consideration and get back to us with it, please.

The Speaker: To the member for Parry Sound, I am very concerned about the point which you raised. I draw the member's attention to our standing order 32(a), which states that, "The oral question period shall be limited to 60 minutes, including supplementary questions and points of order."

The Speaker has no way of knowing whether the matter about to be raised by a member is indeed a valid point of order or privilege unless the Speaker hears it. I have asked members, and I will request them again, unless they believe it to be an urgent matter and a matter truly deserving of consideration as a point of privilege, to keep those points of order until outside of the question period time. It makes it very awkward for the Speaker to determine whether they are legitimate points of order until I listen to them.

I appreciate the matter raised by the member and hopefully it will get smoothed out over the next little while. I am sure members are disappointed to know that the time for oral questions has expired.

PETITIONS

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Brown: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium

requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

This is signed by quite a number of my constituents, and I will affix my signature to it.

Mr Michlash: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I agree with and have attached my name to that petition as well.

Mr Cordiano: I have a petition to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I too affix my signature to this petition.

Mr Sola: Due to the serious effect that this decision has on Elliot Lake, despite being repetitious, I will read the whole petition:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

SCHOOL TRUSTEES

Mr Tilson: I have a number of signed petitions from Palgrave and Bolton and Caledon East in my riding which state:

"Whereas as residents of Peel living in the town of Caledon, we are extremely disturbed with the minority decision of the Peel Board of Education to eliminate the representation of trustees in Caledon by 50%. The vote was 15 for two trustees, 6 against; and

"Whereas one vote out of a 20-member board is unfair; one trustee cannot attend all of the standing committee meetings, ad hoc committee meetings, and fully attend to the 14 schools in their community; and

"Whereas we need two trustees in Caledon to cover our vast area of 270 square miles;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support the private member's bill introduced by our provincial member of the Legislature, David Tilson, entitled An Act to amend the Education Act, 1991, which, if adopted, would permit an appeal with cause to the Minister of Education of such decreases or increases in trustee representation in school boards."

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr McGuinty: I too have a petition directed to the Parliament of Ontario and it is connected with the community of Elliot Lake as well. I present it out of a sense of frustration that we have been unable to move the government to assist the people of Elliot Lake. It reads as follows:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have attached my name to this petition.

Mr Ruprecht: I have a petition which is worth repeating in order to ensure that the government understands the deep-seated feelings of the people of Elliot Lake. This is to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s; and

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I have affixed my name to this petition.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES

Mr Tilson: I have a further petition from my riding which states that:

"Whereas the Peel Board of Education recently voted to reduce the number of Caledon school board trustees by

50% after the November municipal and school board elections; and

"Whereas this action leaves the town of Caledon with only one school board trustee for the first time since 1975; and

"Whereas a single trustee cannot effectively discharge their duties and responsibilities on behalf of the citizens of the town of Caledon;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support the private member's bill introduced by our provincial member of the Legislature, David Tilson, entitled An Act to amend the Education Act, 1991, which, if adopted, would permit an appeal with cause to the Minister of Education of such decreases or increases in trustee representation on school boards."

1530

PURCHASE OF URANIUM

Mr Brown: I have a number of petitions addressed to the Parliament of Ontario:

"Whereas the cancellation of out-of-province contracts has resulted in more than 2,500 job losses in the mining community of Elliot Lake;

"Whereas the unemployment rate in Elliot Lake is at more than 62%;

"Whereas economic diversification efforts require time before results can be experienced and, without a strong anchor industry in Elliot Lake, any diversification effort becomes tremendously difficult;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro, which is ultimately responsible to this government, made commitments to Elliot Lake and its mining companies which resulted in the community's rapid and widespread expansion in the early 1980s;

"Whereas Ontario Hydro has the means to stabilize the economy of Elliot Lake; and

"Whereas Premier Bob Rae and his New Democratic government made a specific promise to the community;

"We petition the Parliament of Ontario as follows:

"To fulfil that promise to the people of Elliot Lake by instructing Ontario Hydro to purchase all of its uranium requirements from within the province of Ontario, namely Elliot Lake, until economic diversification efforts in the community are successful."

I agree with this petition. Over the last week and a half, my colleagues and I have presented the names of hundreds of Elliot Lakers who are most concerned with this question.

SCHOOL TRUSTEES

Mr Tilson: I have a number of signatures from Inglewood, Cheltenham and Bolton:

"Whereas as residents of Peel living in the town of Caledon, we are extremely disturbed with the minority decision of the Peel Board of Education to eliminate the representation of trustees in Caledon by 50%. The vote was 15 for two trustees, 6 against; and

"Whereas one vote out of a 20-member board is unfair; one trustee cannot attend all the standing committee meetings, ad hoc committee meetings, and fully attend to the 14 schools in their community; and

"Whereas we need two trustees in Caledon to cover our vast area of 270 square miles;

"We, the undersigned, petition the Legislative Assembly of Ontario to support the private member's bill introduced by our provincial member of the Legislature, David Tilson, entitled An Act to amend the Education Act, 1991, which, if adopted, would permit an appeal with cause to the Minister of Education of such decreases or increases in trustee representation on school boards."

REPORT BY COMMITTEE

STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS

Mr Hansen from the standing committee on regulations and private bills presented the following report and moved its adoption:

"Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

"Bill Pr3, An Act to revive Lauramar Holdings Limited;

"Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the Town of Oakville.

"Your committee begs to report the following bills as amended:

"Bill Pr37, An Act respecting Eastern Pentecostal Bible College;

"Bill Pr54, An Act respecting the City of North York."

Motion agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LE CODE DE LA ROUTE (POMPIERS AUXILIAIRES)

Mrs Fawcett moved first reading of Bill 87, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act with respect to Volunteer Firefighters.

M^{me} Fawcett propose la première lecture du projet de loi 87, Loi portant modification sur le Code de la route relative aux pompiers auxiliaires.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

DEVELOPMENT CHARGES AMENDMENT ACT FOR THE AIRY & SABINE DISTRICT SCHOOL AREA BOARD, 1991

LOI DE 1991 PORTANT MODIFICATION SUR LA REDEVANCE D'EXPLOITATION POUR LE CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DE CIRCONSCRIPTION DE DISTRICT D'AIRY & SABINE

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 88, An Act to amend the Development Charges Act for the Airy & Sabine District School Area Board.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 88, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil scolaire de circonscription de district d'Airy & Sabine.

1540

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-91

Abel, Arnott, Bisson, Boyd, Brown, Buchanan, Carr, Christopherson, Conway, Cooke, Cooper, Coppen, Cunningham, Dadamo, Daigeler, Drainville, Duignan, Elston, Eves, Farnan, Fawcett, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Haeck, Hampton, Hansen, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Haslam, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Jordan, Klopp, Kormos, Lankin, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Marland, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, McGuinty, Miclash, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y., Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Phillips, G., Poirier, Poole, Rae, Ramsay, Runciman, Ruprecht, Silipo, Sorbara, Stockwell, Sullivan, Sutherland, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, White, Wildman, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger, Wiseman, Witmer, Wood.

Nays/Contre-0

Mr Harris: This bill will suspend the right of the Airy & Sabine District School Area Board to pass a bylaw for the imposition of an education development charge against land in the area of the board in respect of residential development or residential and commercial development until 1 January 1993 in order to stimulate housing starts in the province of Ontario.

If the Airy & Sabine District School Area Board has already passed a bylaw for an education development charge, it will not come into place until 1 January 1993.

**DEVELOPMENT CHARGES AMENDMENT ACT
FOR THE ASQUITH-GARVEY DISTRICT
SCHOOL AREA BOARD, 1991**

**LOI DE 1991 LOI PORTANT MODIFICATION
SUR LA REDEVANCE D'EXPLOITATION
POUR LE CONSEIL SCOLAIRE DE CIRCONSCRIPTION
DE DISTRICT D'ASQUITH-GARVEY**

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 89, An Act to amend the Development Charges Act for the Asquith-Garvey District School Area Board.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 89, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil scolaire de circonscription de district d'Asquith-Garvey.

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

1552

Ayes/Pour-72

Abel, Bisson, Boyd, Bradley, Carr, Christopherson, Conway, Cooper, Cunningham, Daigeler, Drainville, Duignan, Elston, Eves, Farnan, Fawcett, Ferguson, Frankford, Gigantes, Haeck, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Jamison, Johnson, Jordan, Laughren, Lessard, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Marland, Martel, Martin, Mathysen, McGuinty, Miclash, Mills, Murdoch, B., Murdock, S., North, O'Connor, O'Neil, H., O'Neill, Y.,

Owens, Perruzza, Philip, E., Phillips, G., Pilkey, Poirier, Poole, Runciman, Ruprecht, Silipo, Sola, Sorbara, Sutherland, Tilson, Villeneuve, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger, Wiseman, Witmer, Wood.

Nays/Contre-0

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. When a vote is taken, I would encourage members to remain in their seats, please.

Mr Harris: A little explanation of that one: This bill will suspend the right of the Asquith-Garvey District School Area Board to pass a bylaw for the imposition of an education development charge against land in the area of the board in respect of residential development and residential and commercial development until 1 January 1993 in order to stimulate housing starts in the province of Ontario.

If the Asquith-Garvey District School Area Board has already passed a bylaw for—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would encourage members to hold their conversations outside the House. I can hardly hear.

Mr Harris: If they have already passed a bylaw for an education development charge when this bill comes into effect, that will not come into place until 1 January 1993.

**DEVELOPMENT CHARGES AMENDMENT ACT
FOR THE ATIKOKAN BOARD OF EDUCATION, 1991**

**LOI DE 1991 PORTANT MODIFICATION
SUR LA REDEVANCE D'EXPLOITATION
POUR LE CONSEIL DE L'ÉDUCATION D'ATIKOKAN**

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 90, An Act to amend the Development Charges Act for the Atikokan Board of Education.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 90, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil de l'éducation d'Atikokan.

1607

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-52

Abel, Arnott, Bisson, Boyd, Bradley, Brown, Carr, Chiarelli, Christopherson, Conway, Cunningham, Daigeler, Elston, Eves, Ferguson, Gigantes, Haeck, Harrington, Harris, Hayes, Hope, Huget, Johnson, Jordan, Laughren, Lessard, Marland, Martin, Mathysen, Murdock, S., North, Offer, Phillips, G., Poirier, Ruprecht, Silipo, Sola, Stockwell, Sutherland, Tilson, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Waters, Wessinger, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger, Witmer.

Nays/Contre-0

Mr Harris: This bill will suspend the right of the Atikokan Board of Education to pass a bylaw for the imposition of an education development charge against land in the area of the board in respect to residential development

and residential and commercial development until 1 January 1993, in order to stimulate housing starts in the province of Ontario. If the Atikokan Board of Education has already passed a bylaw for an education development charge, it will not come into place then until 1 January 1993.

Mr Eves: In view of the fact that the Premier obviously needs more time to consider my leader's request, I would like to move adjournment of the House.

1637

The House divided on Mr Eves's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 14; nays 71.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

DEVELOPMENT CHARGES AMENDMENT ACT FOR THE ATIKOKAN ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOL BOARD, 1991

LOI DE 1991 PORTANT MODIFICATION SUR LA REDEVANCE D'EXPLOITATION POUR LE CONSEIL DES ÉCOLES SÉPARÉES CATHOLIQUES D'ATIKOKAN

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 91, An Act to amend the Development Charges Act for the Atikokan Roman Catholic Separate School Board.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 91, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques d'Atikokan.

1646

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour—60

Abel, Arnott, Bisson, Boyd, Brown, Carr, Carter, Christopherson, Conway, Cooper, Coppen, Cunningham, Dadamo, Daigeler, Drainville, Eves, Farnan, Ferguson, Gigantes, Grandmaitre, Haeck, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Hayes, Jamison, Johnson, Jordan, Klopp, Lessard, MacKinnon, Malkowski, Mathysen, Miclash, Mills, Murdoch, S., Nixon, North, O'Neil, Owens, Poirier, Peruzza, Runciman, Ruprecht, Silipo, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Sutherland, Tilson, Turnbull, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger, Wood.

Nays/Contre—1

Duignan.

Mr Ruprecht: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am looking at the desk of the leader of the third party. Would you be so inclined as to determine whether he would be tabling all his bills at once so that we might expedite the business of the House?

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Parkdale very well knows this is not a point of order.

Mr Harris: This bill is actually rather similar to the previous one. This will suspend the right of the Atikokan

Roman Catholic Separate School Board to pass a bylaw for the imposition of an educational development charge against land in the area of the board in respect of residential development or residential and commercial development until 1 January 1993, in order to stimulate housing starts in the province of Ontario. If the Atikokan Roman Catholic Separate School Board has already passed a bylaw for an education development charge, it will not come into place until 1 January 1993.

We think this is an important companion bill. Because the previous one carried by the House unanimously for the public school board, we think there should be a parallel one for the separate school board. I am sorry it did not carry unanimously. This is the explanation.

TOWN OF FORT ERIE ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 POUR PROTECTION ÉCONOMIQUE DE LA VILLE DE FORT ERIE

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 92, An Act to protect the economy of the Border Community of the Town of Fort Erie.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 92, Loi pour protection économique de la communauté frontrière de Ville de Fort Erie.

1657

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour—53

Abel, Arnott, Bisson, Boyd, Brown, Carr, Christopherson, Conway, Cooper, Dadamo, Daigeler, Drainville, Duignan, Elston, Eves, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Gigantes, Haeck, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Hayes, Hope, Johnson, Jordan, Klopp, Lessard, Malkowski, Marland, Martin, Mathysen, Miclash, Mills, Morrow, Owens, Poirier, Runciman, Sola, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Sutherland, Tilson, Turnbull, Ward, B., Ward, M., Wark-Martyn, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger.

Nays/Contre—0

Mr Harris: I have a little explanatory note on that previous bill. The purpose of this bill, and I thank members for their unanimous support, is to protect the economy of the border community of the town of Fort Erie by ensuring that government-imposed costs do not undermine the competitiveness of firms in said community.

Mr Eves: Mr Speaker, I think the Premier still needs more time to reconsider his position, so I would move adjournment of the House.

1731

The House divided on Mr Eves's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 12; nays 61.

TOWN OF NIAGARA-ON-THE-LAKE ECONOMIC
PROTECTION ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 POUR PROTECTION ÉCONOMIQUE
DE VILLE DE NIAGARA-ON-THE-LAKE

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 93, An Act to protect the economy of the Border Community of the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 93, Loi pour protection économique de la communauté frontrière de Ville de Niagara-on-the-Lake.

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

Mr Harris: The purpose of this bill is rather similar to the previous bill in that it is to protect the economy of the border community of the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake by ensuring that government-imposed costs do not undermine the competitiveness of firms in the said community. I

thank all members of the House very much for unanimous support of this bill. I am sure they will want to proceed to second reading shortly.

Mr Sterling: I had a few words with the Treasurer earlier this afternoon. He was asking me which committee we wanted the whole budget referred to. I think it would be helpful if we adjourned the House today so that I would have an opportunity to discuss with him what committee might be appropriate for dealing with all these budget matters, so I move adjournment of the House.

1807

The House divided on Mr Sterling's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 11; nays 63.

The House adjourned at 1809.

APPENDIX

PORTRAIT OF FORMER SPEAKER

The Speaker: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, Speaker Edighoffer, other honoured guests, and a special welcome, if I may, to some grandchildren who are seated here at the front, for whom this is an extremely proud moment. It is my pleasure and privilege to welcome everyone here to the assembly and to pay tribute and honour to my predecessor, Hugh Edighoffer.

Special thanks go to the three party leaders, Premier Bob Rae, the Leader of the Opposition, Bob Nixon, and the leader of the third party, Mike Harris, for making time in their very busy schedules to join us on this occasion. All were members of the Legislature when Hugh was Speaker, and during many hours of debates I am sure they must have heard the line, "I'll just wait," at least once or twice, perhaps more often.

The role of Speaker is not an easy one, as I am discovering. The constant daily concerns and points of view of all the members must be balanced so that the business of the assembly is handled in a fair and just manner. I am sure everyone will agree that as Speaker, Hugh managed to accomplish this.

The Speaker also chairs the Board of Internal Economy and is responsible for the day-to-day operations of the assembly. Hugh provided direction to everyone concerned, and it was during his term as Speaker that the start was made to the restoration and refurbishment of this building as it approaches its centennial.

One of the key components of this whole project is a memorandum of understanding which was signed by Mr Edighoffer and the Minister of Government Services turning over the responsibility of this building and its grounds to the members of the Legislative Assembly, quite an achievement.

During his term, 21st-century technology became part of the 19th-century site. Broadcasting of the House started and gavel-to-gavel interpretation was introduced.

Before I turn the platform over to others scheduled to speak, I would like to give you a little background on the artist who painted Mr Edighoffer's portrait. Istvan Nyikos, a native of Hungary, has lived in Canada since 1969. He started painting while studying at the University of Toronto, and after graduation he enrolled at the Ontario College of Arts and studied painting in Toronto and in Florence, Italy. This led him to Europe, where he spent six years painting commissioned portraits in England, Germany and Spain. Since returning to Canada permanently in 1983, he has been painting portraits here and in the United States.

This is the end of my prepared notes. Before turning over the platform to the Premier—and, Hugh, you will get an opportunity to respond—I just want to add a couple of personal comments. As someone who served as a private member during part of Mr Edighoffer's term, I can certainly attest to the fact that Mr Edighoffer fulfilled the position always with dignity and always with a sense of fairness. He served with extreme good dignity and, I must

say, at all times preserved a sense of humour which I as a member appreciated. I know others did as well.

His calmness and his approach to matters were something of which everyone in the assembly and indeed throughout the province could be most proud. He is a man who has served this province with distinction both as a Speaker and prior to that as a private member.

Mr Edighoffer, I wish you the very best in your retirement. The work you have done has made my job easier, and I for one want to thank you.

[Applause]

Hon Mr Rae: Mr Speaker, Mr Speaker Edighoffer, and my colleagues Bob and Mike, and to the artist and of course to Nancy, whose presence here is a reminder of her time here with Hugh when he was Speaker: Let me just say to everyone that Hugh Edighoffer has achieved that status which we in public life all like to think we can aspire to, and that is of somebody who is truly revered and admired by people in all parties.

Hugh, it is not just the representation that you provided for many years to the people from your constituency in Stratford and Perth county. It is the quality, the kindness, the enormous dignity which you carry so naturally in everything you do, and that I think was a remarkable feature of your time as Speaker.

I am probably as responsible as anyone for giving you a difficult time. You called me to order on a number of occasions and there are those here who wish you had done even more than that over the years. I admire you a great deal. You have been a magnificent Speaker for the House. You presided over the chamber at a time of transition and at a time of tremendous change. You brought to the job a firmness and at the same time a kindness which I think will remain with all of us who worked with you for a very long time.

I am particularly pleased that there are so many members of your family here of all generations. It is a remarkable tribute to your sense as a family person and the great affection with which you are held, I know, by all of them. I am sure they appreciate having you around a little bit more than was the case when you were a member and Speaker.

This is a great occasion. Of course Mr Nyikos's paintings are seen and can be seen in this building. His work is well known to all of us and I am sure we are all looking forward to exactly what he has made of you, Hugh. I want to welcome him particularly and say how proud we are to have yet another of his paintings in this great Legislative Building.

Now, without further ado, I would like to turn it over to my counterpart and superior, Mr Nixon.

Mr Nixon: He is talking about weight.

Mr Speaker, Mr Speaker Edighoffer, Mrs Edighoffer, my colleagues in the Legislature and good friends, and particularly all the little Edighoffers, I am delighted to see so many old friends and the family of Hugh here today. Hugh and I go back a good long time and our association has been particularly close. You might think he is much

younger than I, but in fact our birthdays are just within a few weeks of each other. I do not know how he has preserved his youth quite so effectively, but one way is by skiing.

His family knows about this, because I did not realize that Hugh and Nancy had decided to become international skiers until Hugh showed up in the Legislature with a cast from hip to ankle a few years ago. It lent even more dignity to a dignified man.

Long before Hugh had to shed his liberalism, at least in these precincts and elsewhere, we were close colleagues contesting rural constituencies and sitting together in the Liberal caucus while we made these tremendous advanced and progressive decisions that have earmarked our party over these many years. Since the Premier has already spoken he does not get equal time, so I thought perhaps it was a good time to throw it in.

I do want to say what a pleasure it has been working with Hugh, who has always been intelligent and experienced, as well as moderate. There has already been a reference by the Speaker to his good humour, which is unfailing. I have never seen him get angry under any circumstances. That is quite a thing for a Speaker who must remain calm and perhaps outwait the tides of fury as they wash back and forth occasionally, signifying nothing. Of course it is quite a theatre upstairs. Hugh is used to that, being the member for Stratford, and in that connection his experience has been excellent.

It is a great thing for a man like Hugh not only to be elected repeatedly by his neighbours and the constituents in Perth, but to be selected as the Speaker of this House in this fine historic building and in a chamber which, in my view, is gorgeous and very much like home to all of us, where every now and then something useful happens and where the democratic process continues to evolve under the moderating hand of Mr Speaker of the day. Hugh had that responsibility for more than five years and, in my 30 years' experience, has been among the most effective in performing those duties, always maintaining a close, personal friendship with all members of the Legislature in all political parties and also setting an example, I think, in decorum which, from time I am told by letters I receive, all of us could follow.

I am delighted to be here on this important occasion. I am very interested in the art that is in this building and look forward to seeing this particular portrait which I know will be excellent and will be much admired for many, many years to come.

Nancy, I am delighted to see you looking well and enjoying Hugh's retirement. Hugh, I am not sure what the future holds for you, but I think it is a little bit more than just a few rounds of golf. Your experience and your abilities are well known and I know that you will continue to serve your community as effectively in the future as you have in the past. My very best wishes to you both.

Mr Harris: I get to go after both Bob and Bob, but I will not take advantage of that situation. It is not that kind of day and we are honouring a non-partisan, at least for the five years that Mr Edighoffer was Speaker. So Mr Speaker, Mr Edighoffer, Nancy, Premier and Mr Nixon, and family,

I am delighted to bring greetings on behalf of my party on this special occasion, and also to add a few words of my own of a personal nature on how much we have appreciated Hugh taking on the job as Speaker.

You go back in history and the Speaker had to be dragged forward to take on this task because it was the Speaker's role to report to the King or the Queen the will of the commoners in this House of Commons, and if the King or Queen of the day did not appreciate the message, the head came off. It is quite a challenge, even today, to take on this role and to shunt aside your partisanship of the party that you represent to be a voice of moderation and control for all of us from all parties.

I can recall being sent into Perth to campaign for my party earlier on in the 1980s. I do not know why they sent me there, because I knew we were going to get walloped, but they did send me there, I suppose to wave the flag. But the sense I had when I went into the riding was that even those who might have been favourable towards the bent, if you like, of my party were very quick to say how much they admired and appreciated the work and the representation they received from Hugh Edighoffer. So the people of Perth had a marvellous representative obviously for—how many elections?

Interjection: Quite a few.

Mr Harris: Quite a few elections. I would like to say as well to the family: For those of us in public life, and I now, and I know the Premier and I know Mr Nixon, our families give so much in allowing us to do what it is we feel we are compelled or our calling calls us to do on behalf of our constituents and on behalf of our province. It is a huge and tremendous sacrifice for children and grandchildren and all members of the family, and I am proud to be here with you today as we thank Speaker Edighoffer, as we wish him well certainly into retirement. But we are honouring one of so very few people who obtain this position to preside over this Legislature. It is very unique, a singular honour enjoyed by very few people in our province. I applaud the sacrifices one makes and the family makes that have allowed Hugh to perform these years and these five years as Speaker.

I conclude by saying I was hoping that I got to speak after the unveiling so I could comment. However, perhaps it is better that I do not. I too look forward to this unveiling, this immortalizing of Speaker Edighoffer here in our hallowed halls of the Legislature. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

Mr Edighoffer: Mr Speaker, Mr Premier, Mr Nixon, Mr Harris, my friend who was so patient with me when I wanted to move around in the seat a little bit, Istvan, my family, friends, ladies and gentlemen, this is a day that I will always remember. It carries with it many, many fond memories around this place, because 23 years is a long time, so that I guess really it seems like home when I come back here.

I could not help but think when Bob Nixon referred to the fact that I may not have lost my temper at any point, and then I looked at my grandson, Jeffrey, who is just moving there now, is a little restless. One day there was

something taking place in the House. As usual, it was on the legislative television and I guess he had it on at home. I was ejecting a member from the House, and while I was doing that and he was watching it in his home in Lambeth, he hollered out to his mother, "Papa's mad." Believe it or not, that is a true story, so I guess I did lose my temper.

The time has really passed quickly, and I have really enjoyed every part of the parliamentary process. I have to say it has been a real learning process for me. I learned, of course, having been Deputy Speaker for four years and then Speaker for four and a half years. That is not quite half the time I spent here, but it is quite a long time to be a presiding officer. I certainly had the opportunity to probably get a little closer to many members on a non-partisan basis. It also gave me an opportunity to meet with many of the Speakers throughout Canada to try, of course, to let them know how we operated in Ontario. But I think more important, it was an opportunity for me to find out how they operated in other parts of Canada and hopefully have an opportunity to work it in here.

After all those kind words, it is really hard to know what to say. I really appreciate the four speakers who have gone before me and have so kindly made comments about me. When I think back to the time I became Speaker—I believe it was on 4 June 1985—I did have the honour of being nominated and seconded on two occasions by Frank Miller, David Peterson and Bob Rae. It really made me feel that I was part of the place and could play the role as an impartial Speaker.

There is one thing about the history of this place I did want to tell you today. I just put some dates down, because many of you may not be aware that this building came into operation in 1892. The Speaker of the Ontario Legislature was a man by the name of Thomas Ballantyne. He served as Speaker from 1891 to 1895. His constituency was Perth South. In other words, he just lived a few miles south of the city of Stratford.

I thought it would be interesting for many of you, and particularly for the politicians sitting up here, if I would just inform you that before Thomas Ballantyne became Speaker there was an election that was held on 5 June 1890. On 11 February 1891 Thomas Ballantyne was elected Speaker. The House sat in that year from 11 February to 4 May; in 1892 it sat from 11 February to 14 April; in 1893 it sat from 4 April to 27 May; and in 1895 it sat from 14 February to 5 May. There is quite a difference from then until now.

But I feel that maybe there is a little chance that I have brought a continuity from Perth. Thomas Ballantyne was the first Speaker when this was a brand-new building and I was the 32nd Speaker during the last Parliament when, as was referred to by Speaker Warner, the renovation and restoration committee was formed, to try to make certain that this building is maintained for another 100 years. So I feel that there has been a very close connection between the two Speakers, the Legislative Building and Perth county.

I could go on and reminisce. I promise you I will not. I know you have all been very well behaved standing there. But I want to sincerely thank, first of all, my wife and my mother, who is in the audience and who is 93 years old and was, of course, a regular watcher of the legislative channel. With their help, with the help of the rest of my family and the support of all my friends, it has been a tremendous experience. I thank you very, very much.

I must say to Istvan once again that I appreciate his work. I did have a chance to have a sneak preview some time ago, but I think at that time he said: "I just have to put a few more wrinkles in it. There aren't really enough wrinkles." Thank you, Istvan. I think you have done an excellent job and I appreciate the friendship, and even your wife's baking when I was sitting at your place for the portrait.

Thanks very much to all of you. Thank you again, Mr Speaker, Premier, Mr Nixon, Mr Harris. It is much appreciated. It will be an important part of the memories of my life.

[Applause]

The Speaker: I thought the artist made you look 20, and that is terrific.

That concludes our formal ceremonies, but I want to make sure that we have extended a very warm welcome to everyone to join us for a reception downstairs in the legislative dining room. For those of you who are not familiar with the building, you simply have to go around on either side of this staircase and down one short flight of stairs. The legislative dining room is there, where there will be a very pleasant reception for you, and I know that Mr and Mrs Edighoffer might have an opportunity to say hello to the many friends and family.

Again, thank you very, very much for coming for this extremely special occasion.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaitre, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Wednesday 1 May 1991

Members' statements

Assistance to learning-disabled	1095
Mr Callahan	
Greater Toronto area	1095
Mrs Marland	
May Day	1095
Mr White	
Northern transportation	1095
Mr Brown	
Northern health travel grants	1096
Mr Eves	
Hugh Edighoffer	1096
Mrs Haslam	
Tourism industry	1096
Mr Miclash	
Budget	1096
Mr Turnbull	
May Day	1097
Mr G. Wilson	

Statements by the ministry

Assistance to business	1097
Mr Pilkey	
Social assistance	1098
Ms Akande	

Responses

Assistance to business	1099
Mr Kwinter	
Social assistance	1099
Mrs McLeod	
Assistance to business	1100
Mr Sterling	
Social assistance	1100
Mr Jackson	

Oral questions

Tax increases	1101
Mr Kwinter	
Mr Laughren	
Conflict of interest	1102
Mr Elston	
Mr Rae	
Budget	1103
Mr Harris	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Rae	
Conflict of interest	1104
Mr Elston	
Mr Rae	

Tax increases	1105
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Women's legal clinic	1106
Mr Frankford	
Mr Hampton	
Social assistance	1106
Mrs McLeod	
Ms Akande	
Tax increases	1107
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Assisted housing	1107
Mr Sutherland	
Mr Cooke	
Purchase of uranium	1107
Mr Brown	
Miss Martel	
Commercial concentration tax	1108
Mr Harris	
Mr Laughren	

Petitions

Purchase of uranium	1109
Mr Brown	
Mr Miclash	
Mr Cordiano	
Mr Sola	
School trustees	1110
Mr Tilson	
Purchase of uranium	1110
Mr McGuinty	
Mr Ruprecht	
School trustees	1110
Mr Tilson	
Purchase of uranium	1111
Mr Brown	
School trustees	1111
Mr Tilson	

Reports by committees

Standing committee on regulations and private bills	1111
Mr Hansen	
Agreed to	1111

First readings

Highway Traffic Amendment Act (Volunteer Firefighters), 1991, Bill 87	1111
Mrs Fawcett	
Agreed to	1111

Development Charges Amendment Act for the Airy & Sabine District School Area Board, 1991,	
Bill 88	1111
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1111
Development Charges Amendment Act for the Asquith-Garvey District School Area Board, 1991,	
Bill 89	1112
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1112
Development Charges Amendment for the Atikokan Board of Education Act, 1991, Bill 90	
	1112
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1112
Development Charges Amendment for the Atikokan Roman Catholic Separate School Board, 1991,	
Bill 91	1113
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1113
Town of Fort Erie Economic Protection Act, 1991,	
Bill 92	1113
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1113
Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake Economic Protection Act, 1991, Bill 93	
	1114
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1114

Other business

Report of conflict of interest commissioner	1095
The Speaker	
Visitor	1097
The Speaker	
Ministerial statements	1099
Mr Grandmaitre	
Assistance to farmers	1100
Mr Laughren	
Question period	1108
Mr Eves	
Adjournment	1114

Appendix

Portrait of former Speaker	1115
The Speaker	1115
Mr Rae	1115
Mr Nixon	1115
Mr Harris	1116
Mr Edighoffer	1116

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1118
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1121

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le mercredi 1 mai 1991

Divers

Déclarations ministérielles	1099
M. Grandmaitre	

Première lecture

Loi de 1991 modifiant le Code de la route (pompiers auxiliaires), projet la loi 87	1111
Mme Fawcett	
Adoptée	1111
Loi de 1991 portant modification sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil scolaire de circonscription de district d'Airy & Sabine, projet de loi 88	1111
M. Harris	
Adoptée	1111
Loi de 1991 portant modification sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil scolaire de circonscription de district d'Asquith-Garvey, projet de loi 89	1112
M. Harris	
Adoptée	1112

Loi de 1991 portant modification sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil de l'éducation d'Atikokan, projet de loi 90	1112
M. Harris	
Adoptée	1112
Loi de 1991 portant modification sur la redevance d'exploitation pour le Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques d'Atikokan, projet de loi 91	1113
M. Harris	
Adoptée	1113
Loi de 1991 pour protection économique de Ville de Fort Erie, projet de loi 92	1113
Mr Harris	
Adoptée	1113
Loi de 1991 pour protection économique de Ville de Niagara-on-the-Lake, projet de loi 93	1114
M. Harris	
Adoptée	1114

218-244
X1
223



27 1991

27 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 2 May 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 2 mai 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Thursday 2 May 1991

The House met at 1004.

Prayers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BUSINESS

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT (ELECTORAL QUOTIENTS), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ÉDUCATION (QUOTIENTS ÉLECTORAUX)

Mr Tilson moved second reading of Bill 72, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to Electoral Quotients.

M. Tilson propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 72, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur l'éducation en ce qui a trait aux quotients électoraux.

Mr Tilson: I rise this morning to debate my first private member's bill in this House, which is Bill 72, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to Electoral Quotients.

Before I make my remarks, I would like to welcome to this House a number of constituents and trustees from the Peel Board of Education who are sitting in the gallery. There is Beryl Ford from Brampton East; Elaine Moore from Brampton East; Karen Carstensen of Ward 4, Mississauga; Janet McDougald of Ward 1, Mississauga; the chair of the board, who is from Ward 2 of Mississauga, William Kent; Marolyn Morrison of Wards 1 and 2 of Caledon; and Carolyne Wedgbury of Wards 3, 4 and 5 of Caledon.

On the surface, this bill appears to be quite complex. In fact, I submit that it is not. The principle embodied in this bill is one which I hope every member of the Legislature will support.

This bill came about as the result of an incident in my riding involving the Peel Board of Education and the town of Caledon. I understand the situation is occurring elsewhere, specifically, I believe, in Victoria-Haliburton. Mr Speaker, I would like you to allow me to explain this situation.

The Peel Board of Education is comprised of trustees from the town of Caledon and the cities of Brampton and Mississauga. By applying the formula currently found in the Education Act, Caledon would normally get only one trustee on a 20-member school board. The Education Act, however, recognizes the need to redress just such inequitable situations and permits a board to add by a three-quarters vote held no later than 31 March of the election year up to two trustees. It can also cut two trustees through the same process.

Since 1975, the Peel Board of Education, to its credit, has recognized the difficulty only one Caledon trustee would face trying to provide adequate representation for an area of relatively low population covering some 274 square miles.

This year, however, the necessary motion to add the second trustee failed by just one vote; 14 trustees favoured the second trustee while six were opposed. The matter was reconsidered at a subsequent meeting of the Peel board and the results were exactly the same. The six trustees from Mississauga and Brampton who opposed a second trustee from Caledon have variously suggested that axing a trustee would save money and would bring back a true and pure model of representation by population.

But true rep by pop does not even exist between Mississauga wards, and the cost-saving argument has been abandoned by the six trustees. After all, cutting representation saves dimes, whereas one good trustee can save a school board hundreds of thousands of dollars.

But the point of this bill is not to change the section of the Education Act that caused the situation in Peel and elsewhere in the province. The purpose, in fact, is far simpler than that. It is to give the people the right of appeal to such decisions. Without the right of appeal, I would suggest that we have the potential for tyranny of the minority, and I am afraid we have already seen at least one example of that in the Peel case.

1010

Allow me to tell the House about the mood of Caledon residents regarding their education taxes and the Peel board. They are angry, as they are elsewhere in Peel and all over Ontario, and if they were angry before being stripped of 50% of their representation without appeal, they are livid now.

Consider for a moment that when municipal, commercial and industrial assessment is factored out, Caledon ratepayers already pay \$452.67 more per household than Brampton ratepayers and \$288.39 more than Mississauga ratepayers. On the basis of the number of public school supporters, again factoring out non-residential assessment, Caledon ratepayers contribute more per public school supporter than Brampton ratepayers and almost as much as Mississauga ratepayers. The exact same is true on the basis of the number of students from each area, yet Caledon must now make do with one trustee on a board of 20, and there is no right of appeal to this decision.

This is exactly the type of situation, taxation without representation, that gave rise to the most famous of all tax revolts, the Boston tea party, although in this case it might more aptly be dubbed the Bolton tea party.

Allow me to draw an analogy regarding representation which all members, especially those from northern Ontario, will appreciate. Back in 1983, this assembly directed by way of resolution that redistribution maintain not fewer than 15 seats in northern Ontario. For practical purposes, this meant that, based on the 1981 census figures, northern ridings average 51,627 persons, while southern ridings average 68,267. In other words, notwithstanding population differences between north and south, the special circumstances posed by a large area with low population are recognized

here as they are in federal riding distribution. Can members imagine the outcry if anyone suggested otherwise?

Now I know there will be some who will think that giving 50 electors the right to appeal such decisions to the Minister of Education further erodes local autonomy. I would suggest that there are local prerogatives which must be protected and maintained, and then there are those which by their very nature must be appealable to a higher authority. This is one of those cases, and if school boards can cut or add representation without sufficient cause, I would suggest it is only reasonable to allow the public the right of appeal with cause.

I would draw the members' attention to the fact that I have narrowed the grounds of appeal to the Minister of Education to just one point, and that is whether the number of trustees is adequate given the size of the municipality and the number of board committees. That is all. This bill erodes local autonomy only to the extent that it grants to the people who elect boards the right of appeal from decisions by a small minority of trustees.

The right of appeal in this instance is a check against possible abuse and should be welcomed by trustees and ratepayers alike. Indeed, after unsuccessfully reconsidering the Caledon trustee matter, the Peel board voted by a considerable majority to support Bill 72.

I would also draw to members' attention nearly 3,000 signatures, which I have before me, on petitions and letters which I presented to the House yesterday, and the petitions are still coming in, a substantial number of signatures from people all over the riding and even outside the riding, of people opposing the Peel board's actions on this and supporting the bill. I know the Premier and the Minister of Education have received numerous other letters as well because constituents in my riding have advised me of that.

Short of the government introducing its own legislation to deal with this problem, Bill 72 remains the best chance to redress the harm done to Caledon and other similarly affected municipalities. It is imperative that this problem be solved now, before the municipal elections in the fall, because otherwise over half the geographic area of the region of Peel will only have one representative for the next three years.

I realize we can debate the details of the Peel mechanism set forth in this bill and I am open to any amendments at a later stage which maintain the right of appeal and ensure that all those who have been affected this year can appeal.

In conclusion, I would ask for the support of this assembly for this legislation so that fairness and equity may be restored to the people of Caledon and elsewhere in Ontario where this has also happened, and so it may not happen again without the right of appeal.

Mr Martin: This morning I rise to speak to this bill which indeed is an important issue, even though, as the member who introduced it stated, it is not a complicated or a sophisticated piece of business. However, the buildup and the actual case that he presents is complicated and has a lot of ramifications and is not easily answered.

Even though I believe in my heart, because I believe in the democratic process, that there is a way of resolving

these kinds of issues—and we need to be looking at them perhaps more seriously—in view of how things are unfolding in many areas, not just Caledon, with regard to this question, it is not this bill that is going to answer it. This bill is certainly, as the member stated, a simple response to a complex question. It is not going to do it.

The gist of this bill, the underlying philosophical understanding of it, flies in the face of the way I think many of us would like to see, and in actual fact the government has dealt with issues of education and autonomy over educational issues over the last few years.

It is the Minister of Education's understanding and feeling that the local school board, imperfect as that may be, should still have as much say, and in most cases the last say, with regard to how it is represented by the people it serves and how it acts on behalf of those people.

As a matter of fact, the whole question of representation by population in democracies across the world is one that has been under scrutiny for many years and still needs some tremendous work done on it, particularly when we narrow it down to constituencies as small as school board areas or municipal areas and we get into specific situations where people feel that their rights are not being addressed or that they somehow are being unfairly dealt with becomes more apparent.

It is in this light that I stand today to speak against this motion. I think that certainly there is a problem, and others will speak to that as we move forward here this morning. The answer is not in this bill, as the previous member stated, in some sense of tyranny to give the Minister of Education the right to come in where a board has made a decision, overturn that decision and effect change in that unilateral way.

1020

I stand here today to tell members that the minister is indeed listening to the cries of the people of Caledon and other places in this province who feel in front of this situation, who feel they are not having their voices heard. The ministry, because of the resolution brought forth by the member and certainly the letters written by the folks of Caledon and others, is going to be moving with great haste, I believe, to come to an understanding of just what the problem is and to present perhaps some other answers that might be more in the spirit of allowing school boards the autonomy they need in order to do the job they have been mandated to do by the government of this province.

There has to be an answer where people feel their voices are not being heard. In a democracy there always has to be an answer, and when you bring it to the attention of the government in the way the member has this morning, and the folks from Caledon and other places are bringing it to the attention of the government, it needs to be addressed. I assure the Speaker and my colleague across the floor that the minister and the ministry are listening intently to the challenge that is being put in front of them today and that they will in due time come forth with, hopefully, some resolution to this particular issue.

The whole question actually of how we do education in the province has been and continues to be under review, the financing of it and indeed the governance of it. We

look at the rights and responsibilities and needs of the French population in our province and the native people in our province. I believe that thrown into the mix of all of that certainly needs to be the rights and needs of people who live in rural areas, who live in small, isolated board areas, who oftentimes do not feel that they are being given the resources they need to provide the quality of education they see being offered in larger centres where there is indeed a more lucrative tax source.

I say again, even though I stand here sympathetic to the arguments being presented and sympathetic to the situation that has so obviously come to a head in that particular board and, as we will hear this morning, other boards, this bill is, as the member said, certainly not a complicated situation or answer. However, it is not the right answer in light of the philosophic stance taken by this government to education and the issue of school boards having autonomy over those questions which are so important: representation by population and the deliverance of educational services.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I rise this morning to address Bill 72, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to Electoral Quotients introduced by the member for Dufferin-Peel. At the outset, may I say that this is a very complex issue.

I realize that there are difficulties and concerns in this community and within the Peel Board of Education. Some of these seem to be based on personalities and personal perspectives. I can assure the members of this Legislature that indeed a great amount of consultation went into Bill 175, An Act to amend the Education Act and Certain Other Acts related to Education, which was given royal assent 1 June 1988. Indeed, this consultation took place over a period exceeding three years, and I was personally involved in many of those discussions.

Having been a trustee for 14 years, I have a deep and long-standing conviction and respect for the right and responsibility of trustees to make decisions on behalf of the communities they represent. As those in this province who know me will understand and appreciate, the protection of local decision-making, local resolution, local discretion has always been a major personal priority. I continue to believe that any shift in representation should be made by decisions at the local level, where real knowledge of local needs and issues are appreciated and, may I add, I believe that to examine the motives of votes at local levels should never be presumed. The examination of motives of voting patterns is a dangerous practice and is more dangerous when one level of government is looking at another.

There are certain fundamental principles we should all bear in mind when examining trustee representation, as determined by Bill 125, within the broad context of representation by population. Bill 125 provides for consistency across all school boards in this province, whether they be public, separate, urban or rural, and is based on the fundamental principle of proportional representation. May I add that this bill finally brought the election of school board trustees within the same democratic process as the federal, provincial and municipal elections that have taken place over a series of years.

The number of trustees on each board is now determined by population. This is done prior to each municipal election. Population data is determined through the enumeration process under way at this moment in this province as we prepare for the fall 1991 election. Trustees now represent people, not square miles or geographic areas or levels of assessment or wealth, as was the past practice.

The total size of a board is based on the sum of the populations of electoral groups—electoral supporters and their dependents—to be represented on the board. This total population is the determinant of the number of trustees who will comprise the board. This number is arrived at by the application of a uniform formula contained within the legislation itself. The number of members who will comprise the board is distributed among the electoral groups of the board, based on the proportion that each group's population is of the total population of all electoral groups of the board. I said this is a complex issue.

The decision taken by the Peel Board of Education regarding the number of trustees chosen to represent Caledon has, I believe, been taken with full knowledge of the trustees and full knowledge of the community's needs. Indeed, even if the result of the board's vote is maintained, Caledon will be represented by its entitlement according to the Education Act.

The problems that have arisen since that decision seem to involve many personalities, several accusations, the presentation of some facts, the examination of some motives, all of this sometimes out of context, and have left the community in a state of confusion as we enter another period of serious decision-making in the choice of trustees, the municipal elections of 1991.

The joint committee on trustee representation stated, "We...believe that in the development of procedures for trustee apportionment, flexibility should be provided in order to address specific needs and local conditions," and thus, section 206b(6) of the Education Act reads:

"Where a board approves, by a resolution passed by an affirmative vote of three quarters of the members of the board in the year immediately preceding the year of a regular election under the Municipal Elections Act or before the 10th day of August, 1988, an increase or decrease of either one or two in the number of members of the board, the number of members of the board shall be deemed to be so increased or decreased for the next two subsequent regular elections."

I understand the present Minister of Education changed the above date for such decisions to 31 March immediately preceding any regular municipal election year. Section 206b of the Education Act already contains an appeal process, a fact that the member for Dufferin-Peel and Bill 72 completely ignore. I have it before me in my hand this morning.

1030

Mrs Cunningham: What page?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Page 454 of the Education Act. This may be exercised by a municipality, and I understand that the Caledon council is already engaged in exercising that right.

The member for Dufferin-Peel seems to feel that the existing process is insufficient, even though appeals and time lines provided for in this legislation have not yet been fulfilled.

I believe deeply that Bill 72 is a very dangerous precedent. In my mind it is dangerous politics, and thus in my opinion Bill 72 is presumptuous, premature and, I believe, perhaps even out of order.

Mrs Witmer: It is a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to Bill 72, An Act to amend the Education Act with respect to Electoral Quotients.

This act states that boards of education can add or subtract up to two trustees in a departure from straight representation by population. This usually is done in instances of low population in clearly defined areas and it does allow inequitable situations to be addressed.

The act also specifies that three quarters of all trustees must pass a motion to this end no later than 31 March of each election year. Therefore, this action has just been taken by boards of education across this province.

I would agree with previous speakers that this is a complex bill. However, as a former school trustee with the Waterloo County Board of Education, I have been faced with the decision regarding the number of representatives on several occasions and I know just recently the trustees on my board were asked to make that decision again. Each time the Waterloo board decided, after serious consideration, input from the community and hearing all points of view, to increase its size from 18 to 20 trustees, even though in two of the municipalities there was an extremely low population factor.

Indeed, in the areas of Cambridge, Kitchener and Waterloo each trustee represents about 15,000 residents. In the rural municipalities—there are four—each trustee represents 6,500 residents. So, by right, the rural area should only be represented by two trustees as opposed to four. However, the trustees in the region of Waterloo recognize that it is extremely important that the residents in the outlying agricultural areas have access to a trustee in their own geographical area. It is important that they be represented by a local trustee who understands the needs of his or her community and is actively involved in it, and those needs are sometimes very different from those trustees who represent the urban areas.

Yes, it is important at all times that all of the taxpayers' points of view are represented at the board table in order to ensure that the needs of all students within the jurisdiction of the board are met. Therefore, it is indeed unfortunate that the Peel board failed by one vote to pass the necessary motion to have a second Caledon trustee after the municipal elections this fall. It is unfortunate because since 1975 they have been represented by two trustees and now that representation has been reduced to one.

At a time when taxpayers want access more than ever to their trustees and to their schools and they want more involvement in the school system, at a time when committee work for trustees is increasing, this is indeed an unfortunate step. I believe that the voters in Caledon have indeed been unfairly treated.

I would hope that serious consideration be given to changing the Education Act. I believe that the three quarters is unnecessary and I would like to see a simple majority making this type of decision. We need to ensure that all taxpayers have access into the educational system and that they are adequately represented in the decision-making. It is extremely important that special consideration be given to representation in low-population areas that are geographically removed from the bulk of the population.

I am concerned about what has happened and it is my sincere hope that those people throughout the province who have lost representation will be treated in a fair and equitable manner and that very special consideration will be given to them in order that the problem that has arisen this year may be addressed.

Mr Mills: I say it every Thursday, and I say it again this Thursday, that it is always a great pleasure for me to rise in this House and debate bills introduced by members of all parties. I think it best explains the system of democracy that we have here. I have said before that it is a pity that some of these ideas are not carried forward into more extreme levels of government. I think it is a wonderful idea.

Having said that, I came here this morning with some apprehension. I see that the member for Dufferin-Peel is missing from his seat. I saw that great big pile of papers in front of him and I thought for one terrible moment that we were going to get back on Bill 4. I am glad to see that—he is not here at the moment, but here he comes—he is not a one-dimensional member, that he brings forward this Bill 72 with some degree of fervour on behalf of his constituents.

My life has been rather regimented, to say the least. As a result of that, I am a fervent believer in the chain of command. I think that what this bill is trying to do is circumvent the chain of command and I do not know if that is a very good idea. I understand the problems of Caledon and what is happening here. I understand what the member is trying to correct here. I have read the bill.

The bill is good but it is not perfect, and I suppose it is fair to say that most of the bills that we introduce here on Thursdays are far from perfect. I thought about this matter and I discussed with some of the Ministry of Education officials as to why this situation was allowed and what had happened in the past. I am given to understand that the minister or her staff are actively going to look at this matter with a view to correcting it.

I must say that I support the principle of representation by population and I am very worried that if we take away the authority of the trustees, the minister will be under tremendous pressure from school boards all across Ontario to intervene into decisions made by trustees. I do not think that is the minister's role and I think she is far too busy and has lots of things on her plate rather than get involved in that.

I cannot support the member's bill for three reasons. The first reason is that I believe that trustees are much better able to assess and balance the local needs and preferences as elected. I also believe that the intrusion of ministerial discretion into the school board election process works against local accountability. Finally, one of the

problems with this bill, as I see it, is that within the jurisdiction of each board, if electors of one municipality gain representation through the distribution rules, electors in another must lose and electors from each losing municipality might then apply to the minister to undo the decision taken by the trustees they elected.

1040

Mr Tilson: Who's going to lose? No one's going to lose. You don't know what you're talking about. It's full of baloney.

Mr Mills: This will become administratively unwieldy and might render superfluous the board's decision as to distribution.

Based upon my remarks, and despite the interjections of the member—I have the floor, Mr Speaker, and I believe that I have a right to speak uninterrupted—I will rest my case.

Mr Beer: It is a pleasure to participate in this debate because I think our colleague has raised an important and fundamental issue with respect to, in effect, the workings of what was Bill 125. I think sometimes what is particularly helpful in these debates is the raising of the issues. Whereas one may not always agree with the approach, and I have some concerns about what our colleague has put forward this morning, I think it is none the less terribly important that we recognize that in a number of areas of the province the way in which trustee distribution has gone about has not reflected the kinds of concerns and needs that I think particularly those in the more spread-out or rural parts of different board jurisdictions are really entitled to. Perhaps one of the messages the minister can take from our debate today is that this does need to be looked at again.

I would like to just comment on two elements of our colleague's bill which give me concern.

One is that I think it is terribly important, as hard as it is at times, to recognize the principle of local autonomy and try to respect that principle and have the board make the decision. Of course, what is always difficult with that is that there are times when a school board or a municipality, indeed, a provincial government, will make a decision that we believe is unfair and that we would like to see changed. But here, I think, we need to look at the principle and not just at a particular situation. However it may merit changes, as in the case of Caledon.

What would concern me is that we would be affecting that principle of local autonomy. I think we have to try to make sure that school boards are responsible for the actions that they take. If there is a right of appeal to a minister, I think one of the things that inevitably leads to is that representatives on a board may say: "We can take a certain position because in the end it can be appealed to the minister and we'll let the minister make the tough decision. In a sense, it lifts it off our backs."

Having spent a short time as a minister, it seems to me that when you do develop structures that are to deal with local governance, you really have to say then that that is where those issues should be debated, should be discussed

and that this would not be an appropriate area in which to have a right of appeal to a minister.

I feel that very strongly and feel that it is a weakness in this bill, because I see that inevitably there would then be a weakening of that sense of responsibility. Clearly what we are trying to say, whether it is to the Peel board members or to any other school board, is that whether you are representing what is essentially very much an urban part of that jurisdiction or the rural area, in addition to your responsibility to those who elect you, you have a broader responsibility to the whole board and to its jurisdiction. That means that you have to listen to and understand the concerns that may come from particularly those areas of that board's jurisdiction that are spread out where historically there is a concern about the kind of representation that they can have.

I think what this leads to, in my mind, is that if we look at the points that have been raised by the member with respect to Caledon, and I know others of us have some examples in other parts of the province where there have been real concerns around the way in which the trustee distribution has gone forward, I would suggest strongly to the minister that she might want, in working with school boards and others engaged in the educational community, to look again at how that section is worded. Our colleague the member for Waterloo North has suggested that one of the things that might be done is to change the percentage required to make that change. That is certainly one element that could be looked at.

Another element would be to look at some of the definitions that we have in the legislation and try to see if there is a better way of expressing in a more specific sense, in a more directing sense, how many representatives you would need to have in those areas that are deemed to be rural.

That being said, it is still my view that we need to be very clear that we do not want to interfere with the principle of local autonomy and I believe it would be a very grave mistake to write into the legislation some kind of right of appeal to the minister of the day, because I think that would weaken not only the local autonomy but the sense of local responsibility that we want to ensure exists at the school board level.

Mrs Cunningham: It is with a great deal of pride and honour that I rise in the House this morning to speak to this bill as presented by my colleague the member for Dufferin-Peel.

I think what we are talking about today is probably an opportunity to do things differently in government, and I think all members of this House, if they have not already found out, will find out that over the years we are all stuck with legislation that we would all agree needs some amendments. The Education Act is not alone.

Certainly as we take a look at the opportunities that we had in the last three years to look at distribution of trustees and the makeup of school boards across the province of Ontario, it is I think with some degree of pride that the member for Ottawa-Rideau spoke today, because she in fact was a very real part of that, as was the former minister.

The frustration we feel this morning is that we in no way would come to this House and ask to change what we think is a part of the bill that just simply does not work. In what other resolutions would we ask of school boards that 75% of them have to vote in favour of change? I sat on a school board for some 16 years. Basically, a simple majority of the board changed decisions, and that would have been one part of the bill that I did not like and I do not think it is fair.

But we are in a dilemma today. It would be silly for us to come with that amendment to the bill. If we are not successful today, we will put that forth, but that will not help boards in time for the next election. That is a timely process; it takes a lot of public input, and we did not have the opportunity.

I think what the House is seeing today is democracy at its best. A local member has been presented with a problem. All of us get one kick at the can per year, and he has chosen an issue in his own municipality to bring forth a solution to. There are not very many solutions presented in this House. We have the opportunity to speak to one today, and I would underline that it is just what he stated, a short-term solution.

I would also remind the members that those of us who have spoken from the Progressive Conservative Party this morning can only say that we too very much support local autonomy. It is not with a great deal of pleasure that one has to bring these kinds of motions before the House, but I do believe we are looking for solutions to a problem, and this is the one way to do it.

My colleague from Dufferin-Peel will also be responding to the point that was made by the member for Ottawa-Rideau with regard to the appeal within the distribution that is allowed for in the act, and I asked the parliamentary assistant to the minister to look into that, because I think we are here to solve problems this morning. Within this Education Act it is not our understanding that this would be possible. What the member for Dufferin-Peel is asking for is an appeal by resolution of the board with regard to whether it goes up one or two trustees, and it is a technicality, but it is different, and that is the reason we had to bring this bill. We have honestly looked for all angles.

Members on the opposite side have nothing to lose by voting for this legislation this morning. It is not going to pass because they vote for it this morning. They can ask to have it brought back to the House for another reading. They can ask for it to go to committee. I think, in fairness to an excellent member who is serving his public and to a government that should be looking for solutions to problems, that this is a short-term solution and that it is something that should be considered, rather than just throwing it out with disregard, based on perhaps party line. So I will be looking this morning to those members in this House who have thoughtfully listened and are looking for solutions. There is nothing to be lost in voting for first reading today.

1050

Mr Drainville: I rise today to support the bill as set forth by the member opposite. I want to say that the reason is that we have just in the last while been through a diffi-

cult situation in my own area, in Victoria-Haliburton riding.

In Victoria county there was a situation in which the people from the north end of the riding were having difficulties in maintaining their local schools, and so what they began to do was to fight that process. They fought it so hard that they took it into the legal realm. Afterwards, the board decided that it was going to ask those people, 15 people in fact, mostly working class people, some of them on low incomes, to pay for the costs of that legal battle. On top of that, in the last month they have taken away the one extra representative from the north of the riding, which is sparsely populated. So I think it is obvious that there are situations where trustees are not always able to care for the needs, the rights and the aspirations of those in other less populous parts of the area that they are representing. My concern is a very real one and I join with the member for Dufferin-Peel in his concern that there be adequate representation for areas.

In supporting the bill, I also have to say that there are flaws, of course. There are in every bill that we bring forward. I am concerned about the minister being engaged in these kinds of discussions and debates. Obviously the minister is going to be put into many situations throughout the province where if this was enacted the minister would be forced to be involved in a lot of different kinds of negotiations which would not be helpful to the minister or the ministry at times because of the difficult nature of such decisions.

However, on the whole I believe that something needs to be done, I would like to see something done about it as soon as possible, and I would be remiss to my own constituency of Victoria-Haliburton if I did not support the bill as set forth by the member for Dufferin-Peel.

Mr Callahan: Mr Speaker, I understand I have a very short time, and as you know, I chair the standing committee on public accounts. That is why I have not been here for the full discussion. But I rise in favour of the idea, because in the new board structure that was brought in 10 or 15 years ago in a situation such as in my community, Peel, where Mississauga has a certain number of representatives and the combination of Brampton and Caledon has a certain number of representatives, if you lower that number, it makes it very much more difficult for people in Brampton, and I would think the same thing holds true in Caledon, to achieve the moveup of capital structures in their community. It requires a significant amount of lobbying, and if there is not—and I am not suggesting there is not—goodwill, you can wind up with a good deal of the capital going into one area.

This did happen in a sense, I suppose. There was a school board trustee in my riding, or I suppose in my colleague's riding of Brampton North, who was attempting to achieve a school, I think it was in the C section of Bramalea. He had that on the burner for a long time. There was no question in my mind, although I do not like to interfere or get involved in the bailiwick of the trustees, in going around my riding and looking at the problems that were existing in that area, that the school was very much needed. He fought for it, lobbied for it, and finally got it.

That is the difficulty I see in an imbalance, and perhaps it arises from the introduction of mass boards and the introduction even of regional government. If the representatives are not equivalent, then you have some difficulties in terms of trying to lobby constantly, and if you do not have the numbers to lobby with, then in essence you have difficulty in terms of representing your constituents.

In that respect I support the idea. I have some difficulty with the question of it being directed to the minister. Local trustees are elected by the people in their community and have responsibility to the people of that community, and accordingly it should be their bailiwick to deal with the issue. But as I say, I did want to speak briefly to it and I have now had my opportunity to speak briefly.

Mr Tilson: The whole issue of rep by pop has been raised by members of the House, and certainly that is a consideration that needs to be looked at, but so does the whole issue of the geographic area need to be looked at. If this bill fails and if the government does not come up with an amendment, as it is suggesting, to the act, as it has promised that it will, before the end of this sitting, then over one half the geographic area of the region of Peel will have one trustee. All the other trustees will be in the other half. In other words, 19 trustees will cover the 214 square miles that make up Brampton and Mississauga, but the poor Caledon trustee, the one Caledon trustee, will have more, 276 square miles, and that is not fair.

We are talking about a municipal election that is coming up in the fall of this year, and if the government is indicating that it is going to be voting against this bill—and of course they have the votes. They can do as they like on that. I hope they do not. Clearly that is an unfair situation and should be rectified immediately. So if the government is going to vote against the bill, I only hope that it can resolve this before this House rises for this session.

The provision for varying pure rep by population on school boards exists for the very same reason that pure representation by population does not exist at federal or other provincial levels of government. It does not even exist between wards in Mississauga, which makes me marvel at the six trustees who cause this problem. I believe there were five trustees from Mississauga who, by their actions, demanded the rigid application of rep by pop to the citizens of Caledon, and it does not even exist in their own riding. That is the whole reason for this bill. When you get a small number of trustees running the show, that is what local autonomy is.

I believe that if there is not sufficient cause to change something, then there should be a right of appeal. Yes, there is the issue of local autonomy, but it has to be with cause, it has to be fair, it has to be just. The people of Caledon, the geographic area which covers half the area of the region of Peel, do not have that right of appeal.

With respect to the legal issue that was raised by the member for Ottawa-Rideau, certainly I respect her experience in the education field in her past, but I think, with respect, that she should read it again. Section 206b deals with an appeal based on distribution, which is the number of trustees based on the count population with the calcula-

tion of subsection 206a(6). In other words, this is a technical appeal to a judge.

What this bill is doing is an amendment which would add a subsection to this, because this appeal would be based on determination, in other words, the decision to go up by one or two trustees, and that would be an appeal to the minister, which enhances the need for the bill. Essentially what I am suggesting is the addition of the further subsection.

With respect to the comments of the member for Sault Ste Marie, he said he is going to do something. When is he going to do something? If he does not act quickly, Caledon will only have one trustee.

What is wrong with giving the people in an area a right to say how they want to be represented? What is wrong with that? The government is saying and the people who have spoken against this bill are saying the people of Caledon do not have that right, because the decision has been made from another area. It has not even been made by the people of the town of Caledon; it was made by the people from the south part of the region of Peel.

1100

I was a trustee. What a wonderful way to get rid of your opposition. You remove the position. You simply vote them out by a minority decision. You vote the decision out. You do not vote out the people whom the people have voted in. You vote to remove the decision. What a wonderful way. Imagine how the government would love to get rid of the opposition on this side of the House. You remove the position. I would like the members of the House to think of that.

When a board makes a decision, there must be a decision for cause, and that is what the people of Caledon want. They have not heard a sound reason why this decision has been made and why they are losing representation. Percentagewise they are taxed more than people throughout that riding, and yet they are losing one member. They are losing 50% of their riding.

The member for Durham East talks about this bill as not being perfect. When he is around a little bit, I think he will realize that a lot of bills are not perfect. A lot of pieces of legislation are not perfect. Again, I am looking for his alternative. In my opening remarks, I have challenged members of the government or members who are opposing this bill to suggest amendments.

The Deputy Speaker: There is one minute left for the government's side, if somebody wants to use it.

Mr G. Wilson: In the short time I have I would just like to commend the member for Dufferin-Peel for his hard work and obviously well-supported arguments, which I think will have some bearing on the municipal elections this fall. Certainly he has suggested there is wide support throughout the riding for the position of the Caledon trustee, and I think that might have some bearing on the election.

The second thing is that the member for York North said the trustees are elected to represent the area as a whole. With the strong support that the Caledon residents had to get another trustee, it seems to me there is strong

support for their position on the board now. I think the system is working and can work in the fall election to get enough support to find another trustee for the Caledon area.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no more time left for the Liberals.

An hon member: There are 50 seconds.

The Deputy Speaker: No, no, for the opposition.

The member for Dufferin-Peel, you have two minutes to wrap up.

Mr Tilson: If I listen to the parliamentary assistant and the remarks that have been made with respect to why the government is opposing this bill, it appears to be the same reason being made for the member for Ottawa-Rideau. I only ask them to read the bill again or read the current law again, because the provision that exists that we are asking for does not exist in the act. It does not allow what we are asking for. The appeal that exists in the current act allows an appeal based on distribution. We are asking for an appeal based on determination, in other words, the decision to go up by one or two trustees.

The last speaker indicated this will have a bearing on the election. If this bill is not passed or if the government does not come up with a similar bill, they will be voting for only one trustee. They are going to be voting for half the trustees they have now. They will not be around, so the people will have only half the right they have now to vote on. That is why it is imperative that this bill be voted on now. If the government is not going to vote on this bill now, I assume it will have new legislation before this House rises that will be passed and that will allow another trustee to be added to the town of Caledon to give it the representation it has had.

With respect to some of the other comments, again I emphasize that when a decision is made by a board—and it just happens that it has happened in the region of Peel. It could happen anywhere. It could happen in Victoria-Haliburton. I must confess, I congratulate the member for Victoria-Haliburton for breaking ranks with his party on a very—

The Deputy Speaker: Thank you. Time for the first ballot has expired.

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE MINISTÈRE DES COLLÈGES ET UNIVERSITÉS

Mr Perruzza moved second reading of Bill 78, An Act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act to require approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council for transactions respecting university lands.

M. Perruzza propose la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 78, Loi portant modification de la Loi sur le ministère des Collèges et Universités en vue d'exiger l'approbation du lieutenant-gouverneur en conseil pour les opérations relatives à des biens-fonds des universités.

Mr Perruzza: As the title of the act suggests, it is an act to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act

to require the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council for transactions respecting university lands.

Before I proceed to speak on the merits of the bill, I would like to preambule my comments by saying to the opposition and to my colleagues on this side of the House that this is not a piece of legislation intended to be controversial in any way. It is not intended to limit the abilities of universities to be creative with their resources in generating capital funds for university purposes, for university expansion and so on. It is just a measure of public accountability, a measure that would enable public input into what are otherwise public lands and publicly funded institutions and lands acquired through public funds.

I will start by reading the bill essentially. It is not a very long bill and would amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act. It reads, "A university shall not dispose of an interest in real property without the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council." This applies to all conveyances, encumbrances, including charges and mortgages, and leases for periods of 20 years or more.

This particular act does not cover colleges and there is a specific reason for that. Colleges are covered by the current legislation and are required to seek permission of the Minister of Colleges and Universities before they are permitted to engage in private enterprise, that is, entering into agreements whereby they seek to dispose of publicly acquired assets such as lands, buildings and so on. That is a requirement of the act. Colleges are currently covered by that requirement and that public process and essentially a decision by a public official of the crown and of the government.

However, universities are autonomous in this regard in that they are able to enter into agreements and private dealings without either seeking permission of the minister or of the government of the day, that is, the Lieutenant Governor in Council. As I have said, they are autonomous and they are able to engage in these types of enterprises. My bill would simply require them to come through what is otherwise a public process where the public has some input.

I would like to start off by reading two quotes which have appeared in one of our daily papers, one in the Toronto Star of 19 March, a column written by Susan Pigg. I will just quote briefly from the column entitled "Universities Caught Up in a Land Game." It reads:

"It all seems pretty harmless on the surface. Institutions like the University of Toronto and York University are so broke because of inadequate government funding that they are being forced to sell or lease some of their lands for lucrative development. But most of these lands are being done in private. Ontario taxpayers, who in many cases donated or paid for those valuable lands in the first place, don't have any say in whether they will be left as parks or turned into high-rises." This is one of our columnists in the daily newspaper.

1110

Again in the Toronto Star, 6 March, a column written by David Lewis Stein entitled "College Land Deals Sell Out the Public Interest" reads:

"Public institutions are not just raising money by peddling bits of land; they are selling off part of our common inheritance, public space, most of it green public space, that some day we are going to need."

My particular views on the subject are not as extreme as Mr Stein's or Ms Pigg's, for that matter. However, I am concerned because in my own particular riding it was not long ago that York University approached municipal council and decided to sever off 22 acres of itself essentially and entered into a private deal with a developer to build six condominium towers, a total of 1,500 condominium apartment units. They generated from this deal roughly \$33 million which they in turn reinvested into the university for university expansion.

My concern is not directed at that particular deal. My concern is that there was no public process. There was no public input before the university engaged in its private dealings with a private developer to sever lands and proceed with the development of the campus.

I think this is fundamentally wrong. People from your own local communities come up to you as representative of a university or as a representative in government, and universities are generally seen as being umbrella institutions of government, and say: "What's happening here? How come we didn't have an opportunity to voice our opinions and our concerns with respect to this deal? We would have no problem in supporting the university in this enterprise. However, we would like to have seen these particular changes, etc." As the member, one is only able to look these taxpayers in the face and say: "Well, I'm sorry. Universities are autonomous. They can engage in dealings in a private matter just as any other private individual in this province would be able to."

Of course, the response from community members is immediate. Their response is: "Don't I pay taxes? Aren't universities publicly funded by my tax dollars? Shouldn't I have some say in what the university will and won't do? Aren't there any community representatives on the university board of governors? Isn't there anyone I can speak to to express some concerns with respect to this deal?"

Of course the answer has to be no, because as members are well aware, in some cases there are no public appointments to university boards of governors. They are self-perpetuating, and I hope that at some point our government takes the initiative and embarks in a direction where that particular deficiency is redressed, but that is another matter for another debate on another day.

I think we should stick to the issue at hand in this particular case and that is just what this bill does. Basically, this brings universities through a public process where taxpayers, community members and people who live near or within universities are able to come to a publicly elected official and say, "I have some serious reservations about this deal," or: "I'd like to support this deal. I'd like to support the university in this particular endeavour." That is what this particular piece of legislation is intended to do. It is intended simply to integrate the public taxpayers into a public process where there is a public interest in publicly funded institutions.

I would hope the members in this House this morning support this initiative.

Mr Daigeler: It is the custom in this House to say it is a pleasure to stand up and speak to whatever is before the House. However, on this particular bill we are addressing today, I cannot honestly say I take great pleasure in doing this. While on the face of it it seems a rather innocuous bill, in its implications, when we carry it through to its logical conclusion, I think it is very scary indeed. I will explain what I mean by that in just a few minutes.

More and more we seem to have a tendency in private members' hour to address what I think are purely local grievances which have their role and their place in local politics. We are all aware of that. Many of us have a municipal background. But when we bring up matters here at Queen's Park, I think we should be very careful about trying to correct local problems with provincial solutions, because they have repercussions all across Ontario. What may be appropriate in the member's riding or even in the member's general area may not be appropriate at all for my area of Ottawa-Carleton or for anywhere else in this province. Quite frankly, even on the previous bill I felt the same way, that here were very local issues being raised perhaps to score some political points at home, but if they were really accepted by this House, they would have a very tremendous and in my opinion negative impact on the whole province.

What is the member trying to solve? He has explained that there are situations in Toronto where some of the universities are trying to use some of their assets to create revenue. He is saying there is no public involvement in whatever the university decides, and I do not think that is true. There has been extensive debate in the Toronto area on some of these decisions. In fact, any zoning changes have to be approved by city council. In this case, I understand city council first approved it, then withdrew the approval, and there was ample opportunity for the public, as there should be, to make presentations to elected officials. I understand that then the university went to the Ontario Municipal Board and the Ontario Municipal Board, as the arbiter in those cases, gave reason and right to the university against the decision of the local council.

That is the appeal process we have in this province. I do not think that should in any way, shape or form be overridden by the heavy hand of the government and of the cabinet, interfering and saying from the top down, "This is the way it is supposed to be." In fact, if you do not like an OMB decision, there is still the appeal possibility to the cabinet. It is there. It is hardly ever used and it has to be a very severe case indeed, but it is there. So why say that every decision that will be made on land disposal or any kind of real estate action by a university ought to be approved by cabinet?

Quite frankly, I think that from a practical point of view this is a rather ludicrous idea. What else? Is the member going to grind down the work of the cabinet with every land decision that a university makes? Not that the cabinet right now is moving very fast, but to burden it with every kind of day-to-day decision by universities, just from a

practical point of view, never mind the philosophical one, I think is not serious.

I think more important, though—and this is the scary part to which I referred a little bit earlier—is the idea that the cabinet or Big Brother here at Queen's Park should override, if it does not like a decision, all the things that have been done at the local level. In my opinion, that is the scary part. That is the mindset that seems to be behind the member for Downsview. Of course, it is a socialist idea: central government. You centralize all the decisions. You eliminate local decisions. That, of course, inspires the member on other decisions as well, and I must say I respect that. He got elected. He is an NDP member. He is a socialist and he wants central government, and he feels whatever he thinks is the right thing ought to be imposed on everyone else.

1120

Well, I am a Liberal and I do not agree with that. I think there is tremendous room for debate, for local decisions, for appeal options. But in the end, it is not up to the highest level of government to say, "This is the way it should be and we're going to force our opinion through, no matter what." In my opinion that is the scary part about what appears to be a rather innocent initiative in the first place. I hope that through the perhaps four years—should it be five years? I hope not—of this government, we will not see more and more of this centralizing, socializing tendency and increasing emphasis on government.

I think we have a very important role for the universities to govern themselves. I do agree to some extent with the member that we want our universities to be open and accountable, and perhaps there are improvements to be made. I think the universities themselves recognize that. We had the universities appear before the public accounts committee, and I think the member was even there for part of that. The universities clearly recognize that they want to further improve their public accountability, their public responsibility.

Most of the universities already have public representatives on the boards. They hold their meetings in public; at least they try more and more to do that, and improvements can be made in that. I will certainly push for it, and I think the universities are open towards that, so I do not think there is any need at all to come in with a heavy hand and require cabinet approval each and every time a university wants to take out a debenture or make a real estate decision and sell some land or buy some land in order to improve its situation.

Finally, if the member really wanted to do something for the universities, I think there is something very easy and very obvious that he could have done, rather than limit their options for revenue-raising; that is, talking to the Treasurer and at least telling him, "Mention the universities in your budget." Did the Treasurer even mention the words "universities" and "higher education" in his budget? There was no reference at all. There was some remark on the community colleges, but nothing at all about the university sector. If the member really is concerned about the viability of our universities, why did he not pressure his colleagues on his side of the House to improve the funding

situation for the universities? Why is he just trying to take away a revenue source for some of the universities?

The member has mentioned that some areas will be losing valuable park space. That may be so. However, if a city or a municipality wants to create park space, there are other options. You have to ask yourself, why should the whole province pay for the park space of a particular municipality? I do not think there is any rhyme or reason to that. If they want to have a park, sure, why not? I think we are all in favour of green space. But I do not think the burden should fall on the university to provide what is the responsibility of a municipality. If the municipality wants to preserve that space, let the municipality and the local taxpayer pay for that recreation space they want. That is an option that is there for any taxpayer and for any local councillor throughout the province. I think that is where that responsibility should lie.

I want to leave a few moments for my colleague a little bit farther down the road who will be speaking on the same motion, but I did want to indicate that I am very opposed to this particular motion. The main reason is that I see the big socialist brother behind this particular bill, imposing his will on everybody else across the province and especially on people at the local level.

Mrs Cunningham: It is an interesting bill that we have before us. I am wondering if the Minister of Colleges and Universities or his parliamentary assistant will be speaking to this later. I would be most interested in knowing what he has to say about guidelines that are presently in place. However, again I think that the member for Downsview has received some pressure. He certainly reads the newspapers, as the rest of us do. There are probably a couple of issues that he is very concerned about in bringing this legislation before us today.

I think on the surface most individuals, citizens across the province of Ontario, feel very badly about the fact that the universities have been put into a position where in fact they are having to sell their property. The process by which they sell this property, however, is not unlike the process by which school boards sell their property.

In fact, I should tell members that school boards right now do not have to go to the Lieutenant Governor to get permission to sell their land. But because it is, I think, an extremely serious decision on their behalf, and since their land was in fact acquired through the public purse—most school board properties have been purchased by the boards through taxpayers' dollars—therefore they have restrictions and guidelines for selling them. The first item they must deal with is to sell any public property that is owned by school boards to other boards first. Then there is a certain series of public bodies that they have to relate to—municipalities, colleges and universities—to make certain that the public is not interested in first acquiring public property.

It is interesting to note that if anybody wanted to change how we sell off public property, the last place one would go to set a precedent would be universities. Most universities in this province were not given one penny from the public purse for their own land. The University of Western Ontario was never given any public property. So

if this bill were passed, why should they have to ask the Lieutenant Governor to sell property that in fact does not belong to the public? It is a private institution. All of the land was donated to them, it is still being donated to them, and for the first time they are having to face selling off their property for very different reasons. Right now they need the money, and that is why they are having to do it.

Before I get into that, I think that the member should understand, and this House should clearly understand, what these guidelines are. The ministry, because of this kind of public pressure, did in fact send out some guidelines on 19 August 1988 that the universities have to follow. I cannot stand debating if we do not have the facts, so this bill was very important to me as the critic for the Progressive Conservative Party.

Right now, the specific guidelines are:

"The universities and related institutions should notify the minister of their intention to sell or lease any of their lands. The ministry will then bring this information to the attention of other ministries that may wish to acquire the land at market value to implement such initiatives as the Housing First policy." That is a specific requirement now.

What really bothers me about newspaper articles that say, "College Land Deals Sell Out The Public Interest," "Colleges Find Land Can Work Wonders," "Hotel To Be Allowed on Campus"—I do not know if that was good or bad; I did not read it—"Cash-Starved University of Toronto Looks to Far East For Donations," "City Blocks Hotel on Campus Lands," "Centennial Seeks to Sell Land to Developer"—it is a problem, there is no doubt, but the problem is not that the ministry is not aware of what the universities are doing.

They must, with today's guidelines, come to the minister and say: "This is what we'd like to do. Are there any public institutions that need this land first? What do you want us to do about it?" When in fact the minister says, "Proceed," they proceed. On the other hand, I suppose if the minister said, "You can't proceed," then they would say: "All right. You give us the money so that university students today will be given the opportunity for an excellent education."

1130

There is a shortage of permanent, full-time faculty, and buildings are rapidly deteriorating. Students are finding themselves in overcrowded classrooms with outdated facilities and equipment. It is becoming more difficult for students to learn in the environment they are being subjected to. Without the resources to produce a highly skilled workforce and advanced research facilities, Ontario will be unable to compete in today's global markets.

We are currently experiencing job losses due to these times of economic recession. It is even more important that we support free activity, competitiveness and commitment to a well-educated workforce. Ontario must remain in the forefront of scientific and technological development and educational achievement if it is to maintain its competitive position in today's global economy.

Ontario universities make a major contribution to this province's competitiveness and they play a vital role in the development of highly skilled human resources. They play

a key role in creating and sustaining vibrant research and development infrastructure in this province, contributing and drawing from the global expansion of knowledge. It is because universities are so inadequately funded that they are forced to generate income from land sales and leases.

The Council of Ontario Universities in response to this bill today believes that universities have been following the ministry guidelines. If they are not, they would like to be informed. The guidelines do not apply to lands acquired by private donations. Otherwise, the University of Western Ontario would not have to even follow those guidelines because not one penny from the public purse bought those lands. So right now those guidelines do not apply to Western.

This bill would be a disincentive for donors, and I underline that. Right now donors are giving property, whether it be for capital property or whether they are giving equipment. They want to know that the university has control over that property and equipment; that is why they give it. When we give our own private money and we donate, we like to know that, for whatever reason we give that money, to whatever charity, it is being well distributed to the people first and not in administration. People who bequeath property to universities give it to the university to be used for educational reasons. Therefore, it is very difficult now for the universities to turn around and have to sell it at all.

When Western sells its property it does so—and I will read a letter very quickly from the University of Western Ontario:

"On behalf of the board of governors of the University of Western Ontario, I wish to express my strong opposition to the proposed Bill 78, which requires the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council for sales, mortgages and long-term leases of university lands. There are many reasons for this position, the most important being the following:

"The University of Western Ontario is an autonomous institution created by an act of the Ontario Legislature. This act fully and specifically empowers the board of governors of the university to buy, sell, mortgage or lease land.

"With very minor exceptions, none of the land owned by the University of Western Ontario was purchased with funds provided by the provincial government. These lands were purchased with private funds or were received by the university through bequests.

"It is absolutely essential that the university be able to manage its land holdings. This includes the acquisitions of property to safeguard the long-range future of the institution, the disposal of property which will not meet a short- or long-term need and the development of property, either to meet academic and research requirements or to generate badly needed revenue for the institution. All of these matters are essential parts of an institution's long-range planning strategy. Indeed, the University of Western Ontario has just completed the preparation of campus planning guidelines which speak to these very issues.

"For these and other reasons, the proposal to require the universities to obtain the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council before proceeding with land transactions is both

inappropriate and highly dysfunctional and should be strongly resisted.

"Yours very truly,

"John Brant

"Chairman, Board of Governors"

What did York University say? I contacted Mr Biggs, the President of York University Development Corp. This corporation was established in 1985 when the university realized provincial grants were no longer sufficient to meet expansion needs, the method of generating cash flow.

The only asset the university has is its land base. It is a new university. It is not like Western, it is not like the University of Toronto. York has a lot of land and can never utilize all of it for academic purposes. They need the dollars for infrastructure.

In 1990, York received approval from the Ontario Municipal Board to sell 22 acres of land at its main campus to a developer, Bramalea Ltd. York put the money towards—and I underline this for people who are writing articles in newspapers. Was there a story written about this?—a fine arts centre, three new academic buildings, a 383-unit student housing development and a student centre.

York University is very opposed to this bill. They had to sell property they did not need to build buildings that normally the public purse would be building, if we thought universities were important.

My colleague will be speaking to the University of Toronto, I have already spoken to the University of Western Ontario. I will just close by saying that the one thing we have to do in this Legislative Assembly is to get up and give the best information we can give today, and I am happy to have the opportunity to speak to this bill because it gave us an opportunity to say other things.

The best thing that can happen as a result of this debate today is that members in this House should go to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. They should tell him about the problems that they heard today during the debate from my friend the member for Nepean and others. They should say, "We really do need to talk about why the universities are having to sell off their buildings and their properties."

Mr White: It is a pleasure to rise today to address my colleague's bill. I have very fond memories of universities and university life. In fact, my memories were so fond that I repeated them at several different institutions, at the University of Toronto, at York University, the area that my friend represents, and at Wilfrid Laurier University.

Universities are special places and a very difficult balance must be maintained between their needs to remain independent and their being an integral part of the economic, educational and public life of our province.

Ontario has made massive investments in our universities, including especially capital funds for lands and buildings. As an alumnus of the University of Toronto, the proposed development of Victoria College lands by Huang and Danczkay Properties for a large hotel that my colleague the member for London North referred to, and of St Michael's College lands by Tridel Corp, causes profound concern not only to me, because I see the university life and the community changing dramatically, but also to the

students as a whole and to many other alumni, to the local community and, I believe, to the public as a whole.

Tridel is a corporation rumoured to have had generous, one might even say liberal, access to the previous government. Public openness and public accountability are keystones for our new government. Our government has no secret dealings with such developers. The public, we believe, should have an eye on such developments involving key public institutions. As they do, such developments should be open to public scrutiny and beyond reproach.

The issue of accountability for public funds was brought out not only in March, but I read in today's lead editorial in the Toronto Star questions about that very university. The arguments for these developments were that those funds were necessary, yet I read here that there is some \$100 million in pension fund surplus that the University of Toronto holds on to. How that can be when they need money from these developments?

1140

The editorial says:

"Alumni and others have a nagging feeling that something is wrong at the University of Toronto.... Eyebrows were raised last year when the Provincial Auditor couldn't find \$127 million worth of furniture and equipment at the university...the university refused to show the auditor what it received in private endowments and from private sources... Yet between 1986 and last year, it built a \$100-million pension fund surplus."

These come at a time when universities seem bereft of funds. This creates a very curious feeling for the public and for the alumni. As an associate, when I have taught at the University of Toronto at the faculty of social work and when I have worked as a field instructor there, I have been struck with how antiquated the materials are. I look at some of the technology; it is the same technology that was introduced when I was a student there more than 20 years ago, yet there are all these moneys supposedly available.

I think accountability for public funds is essential. The public needs to know. This bill is only a very minimal eye on developments of what are essentially public lands, and a small part of these institutions' financial dealings. There is no major infringement on the independence of universities. There is no major infringement at all, no infringement whatsoever in terms of academic freedom. There is only a very small window so that the public will have an idea, a sense and a confidence in these public institutions and in the way in which their lands are being used.

I want to conclude that I am in full support of my colleague's bill. I think it offers just a very small window, a very small first step towards allowing the public the kind of eye on a large institution which they should have and they will have with this progressive and open government here at Queen's Park.

Mr Beer: In rising to speak on this ballot item, I think again we have an issue where it is important that we look at some of the specific principles that are inherent in the proposal the honourable member has made. With this one, as with the previous bill, I have real concerns around the

principle that a university would have to seek approval in terms of what it is doing with lands.

When we look at the situation that universities are in, when we look at their governance structures, clearly we have tried to devolve authority for the running, the administration of the university to the board, senate or whatever the governing body may be in that particular case and said, "That is your responsibility, and as you look at what your needs will be for the university, some of those needs may relate to ways in which you are going to make use of the lands that you have and ways in which you can ensure that there is indeed more funding for the various things you are trying to do."

One of the elements that concerns me about this approach is that far too often the reflex action is to say that no matter what kind of local authority we have constituted to make decisions, we want a kind of a Big Brother, a Big Sister, who is ultimately going to make the decision. Clearly, what we are trying to do is to ensure that those local bodies, those authorities that have been duly constituted, have the responsibility to sit down to examine the facts, to look at what the needs of the university are and then to make decisions after proper discussion and consultation.

All of that being said, I think when we are looking at specific decisions, whether it is York University, the University of Toronto or any other university in the province, we have to respect the authority that we as a Legislature have granted to those bodies, and respect that they are going to have to look at how they can find the wherewithal to run that university effectively and efficiently for the whole community within that university, and also in terms of how it relates to the community around them.

It seems to me that if what we are saying is that every time a university or any other local authority needs to make a difficult decision somehow that has to come back to Queen's Park, what that does is to rob and sap the responsibility of that local authority, of that local body.

What we should be trying to do is to ensure that the principles that are in place in guiding, in this case, universities, will make very clear that these are serious decisions, but that those who are on the board are part of the governance structure and are there to make those decisions after looking very carefully at all of the factors involved.

It seems to me that if we add yet another level to that decision-making, if I were sitting as a member of the board I do not know why, then, I would bother to really sit down and deal with that issue in as serious a way if I knew, "Well, look, the final authority for this is going to go down to Queen's Park, so let all those people who want to centralize everything do it."

The principle of the bill that is being proposed here today to amend the Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act I think is one we do not want to lightly pass, because that robs the authority of that local body. For that reason, whatever the issues or problems some members may feel exist because of what universities may or may not do with the lands they own, I think this way is not the right and proper way to proceed.

Mr J. Wilson: It is a pleasure to rise today and speak on Bill 78, a bill that would take away the right of univer-

sities in Ontario to control their own lands. In many cases those lands, as my colleague the member for London North has already said, are private lands. They were acquired through private money or through bequests or donations to the university, and this socialist government does not have the right to take control of those lands.

Also, shame on the member for Durham West who put down my alma mater, the University of Toronto. The University of Toronto has been most co-operative in helping this socialist government improve the audit process for the universities. I would ask the member for Durham West to do his homework. I would also ask the member for Downsview, who has put forward this bill today, to do his homework.

I want to bring forward the example of the University of Toronto and, in particular, the University of St Michael's College, which is one of the five or so private universities that make up the University of Toronto. It is the university I attended. His bill today is both injurious and insulting to the University of St Michael's College and also to Victoria College. Both those universities have land development proposals in the works. Victoria's has already been approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. St Mike's is before Toronto city council; it is expected to pass and then it will go to the OMB.

Universities do not easily sell off lands. They do it because governments fail to fund them fully. In the case of St Michael's College, it is a double whammy. It is an insult to that university, because the priests and nuns who founded that university and continue to work there donate two thirds of their salaries, each and every year, to the operation of the University of St Michael's College. That means it is a good deal for students to go to that university, and it is a good deal for the public, because it gets the government off the hook for several million dollars a year. The government does give money to the University of Toronto, which in turn gives some money and block operating grants to St Michael's College. The rest of the money comes through private donations and the blood, sweat and tears of the religious who serve that community.

1150

For some 30 years now, St Michael's College has been fully accessible, because our government brought in requirements for accessibility and St Mike's voluntarily bought into those requirements. There is no religious test for any student who qualifies academically; anyone can attend that university. I say it is a good deal for the public, and the government does not have the right to take away St Mike's right to control its own lands.

The member for Downsview should know that universities in Ontario for the most part have boards of governors. I served on the University of Toronto board of governors for a number of years. He should know that on those boards are government appointees, some 16 at the University of Toronto. They are there precisely to protect the public interest, and if his constituents have problems with York University or with the University of Toronto selling off lands, then he should inform them of their right to talk to those government appointees; in fact, he should talk to those appointees himself.

That is the process. They are there, they help make these decisions and they do not take them lightly. They do them because they have to provide a quality education to the students who attend those institutions. The only way they can do that is to get some money out of the lands they own, and the government does not have the right to control that.

Mr Mammoliti: I initially did not really want to speak on this issue. I thought my colleague the member for Downsview dealt with it pretty clearly. I did, however, hear some distracting comments and I felt compelled to stand up and respond, more specifically to the comment from the member for London North, who said we do have a problem. Yes, I agree with her. We do have a problem when it comes to this. She said we should not take the control away from the boards.

I feel somewhat distressed by that comment. I am going to speak personally. I am going to speak representing Yorkview today. Recently there have been some problems with the university that exists in our neighbourhood, York University. She brought that up during her speech. Recently there have been some meetings in our area that have been pretty clear when it comes to the standpoint of the community and what it wants.

Frankly, the community does not want any more high-rises in our particular area. It has made that quite clear. There are a lot of people in our intersection at the Jane and Finch area. They have made it clear that any more building would only prove to be a problem when it comes to existing services. For example, the sewer system in our area is at full capacity. We cannot hold any more buildings in our area.

What has happened since then is that they have gone ahead and done what they felt they had to do anyway. So who is controlling whom, I ask? Are we trying to control the board or, in this particular case, is the board trying to control the community? I have a problem with that. The community said no, it does not want it. The board went ahead anyway and tendered out and has picked out its own building company. It is going to be building a few buildings in that particular area. There were a lot of suggestions made by the community, one of them a dormitory for the students, another a community centre; we are in desperate need of a community centre. They ignored every one of those suggestions and went ahead and did what they wanted.

I say we do not need the board controlling the community. This bill puts restrictions on the decisions, and I do agree with that. Revenue source: We are not taking away any revenue source. We do not want to do that. We are saying, give the taxpayer a say. The taxpayers in my community certainly had their say, and wanted their say, but nobody was heard. They went ahead and did what they wanted anyway.

I disagree with the member for Nepean, who said that the member for Downsview wanted to score some political points. I have had the pleasure of knowing the member for Downsview for a few years, and I assure members that his concern is not for political reasons. His concern is for the province and for the community, and this government's

concern is for the taxpayer. We have been pretty consistent in saying that the taxpayer should have a say and has not in the past. That is why I agree with this bill and that is why my community agrees with this bill, because it feels it should have been heard and it was not.

Mr Perruzza: It is wonderful to have another opportunity to look at some of the arguments that have been put forward by the opposition. Either I have been completely misunderstood this morning or I was not clear, so I will try to address some of the comments that were made by the member for Nepean with respect to planning process. I will try to simplify it in some ways.

Every private individual in this province has certain rights under the Planning Act and the planning process. Any member can take any rezoning matter through any municipal council and to the OMB, and there are a number of public hearings.

That is not at all the part of the process my legislation is intended to address. My legislation is intended to address the point at which the universities enter into deals with private developers. Once the university has entered into a deal and that deal is done, then of course there is a planning process, but the debate at that point becomes: How much density? How high do we want to go? How much do we leave for parking space? Where do we build the roads? Where do we not build the roads?

Obviously, there is a misunderstanding with the principles of the planning process. Of course that decision can go through to the OMB. Any developer or any member of the community can take that decision to the OMB, but only after the university has discharged its lands to a private developer for private enterprise and private purposes.

Obviously, the member for Nepean does not quite understand the planning process or what my particular legislation is intended to do. He talked about "socialist" and this is Big Brother moving into a particular area of education, that we are going to take over and control the whole process. That is not what is intended by this at all.

If being a socialist, being an NDPer, means to allow the public, the taxpayers in Ontario an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns before publicly acquired, publicly funded lands are disposed of by a particular entity, by a university, then so be it. I will always fight for that public. I will always fight for the right of that public to have an opportunity, to have a say in what is done by institutions disposing of publicly acquired assets.

The member for London North talked about school boards, and whether we would do this with school boards, because are school boards not doing essentially the same thing? She could not be more wrong. I believe she was involved with school boards or was a trustee in her other life. As she well knows, trustees are publicly elected representatives of ratepayers, either public or separate. They are publicly accountable to their electorate, just as we are. At election time, if they do something that is inappropriate they are held publicly accountable. They are booted out of office, they are voted out of office, and no trustees would enter or engage in dealings where they know they are going to get booted out of office. That is politically not very smart.

1200

She also talked about lands that are essentially donated, as in the case of the University of Western Ontario, which has acquired its lands not from government in the form of a grant or deeded to it. I think there is a fine line, and Western, I suspect, would have a good case if it appealed a particular decision to sever lands and so on. But there is a fine line. Western is funded by government. It delivers programs funded by this government, funded by the taxpayers of Ontario. I think there is a fine line between at what point the public interest in those properties begins and ends. In the case of Western, that may be an exception.

Also, the member talked about guidelines. As she will know, in 1988 the Supreme Court of Canada made a ruling with respect to universities and basically ruled that they are autonomous bodies. If she checked the legislation, she would find that. Also in the universities act, they are completely empowered to do with their lands what they will without a public process.

The Deputy Speaker: You have two minutes to wrap up.

Mr Perruzza: If the member checks the universities act, she will find that every university is empowered to dispose of its properties as it will.

My intent this morning has been completely misconstrued and misunderstood by the opposition. My intent is not to impede universities from being creative with their resources, from being able to engage in private enterprise, to raise funds for university purposes and for university expansion, and I will say that again. Obviously, the opposition has misunderstood it. My intention is to provide a mechanism that will allow for public input before the done deal.

Before the university engages in a deal with a private developer, it has to come to a publicly elected body such as this, such as government, and say: "Hey, we want to engage in this. What do you guys think of it? Do you think it's a good way for us to go? We are going to raise \$40 million or \$60 million and expand a fine arts building, expand a particular university centre." Then we, as the elected representatives of the people of the province, who are entrusted with public funds and public lands and the governance of those funds and those lands, will be able to say: "Yes, Mr University, this is a good deal for you. You may proceed with the planning process, sever your lands, sell your lands and engage in a process whereby you are granted the zoning and able to raise the funds you require."

I ask my colleagues for their support this morning.

1210

EDUCATION AMENDMENT ACT (ELECTORAL QUOTIENTS), 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR L'ÉDUCATION (QUOTIENTS ÉLECTORAUX)

The House divided on Mr Tilson's motion for second reading of Bill 72, which was negatived on the following vote:

La motion de M. Tilson pour la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 72, mise aux voix, est rejetée :

Ayes/Pour-16

Arnott, Callahan, Caplan, Cousens, Cunningham, Drainville, Harnick, Jackson, McLean, Runciman, Sterling, Stockwell, Tilson, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

Nays/Contre-40

Abel, Beer, Boyd, Bradley, Brown, Cooper, Coppen, Cordiano, Dadamo, Daigeler, Duignan, Frankford, Gigantes, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Haslam, Hope, Jamison, Johnson, Klopp, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mammoliti, Martin, McLeod, Mills, Morrow, Murdock, S., O'Connor, O'Neill, Y., Owens, Perruzza, Silipo, Sullivan, Ward, M., Waters, Wessinger, Wiseman, Wood.

MINISTRY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AMENDMENT ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 MODIFIANT LA LOI SUR LE MINISTÈRE DES COLLÈGES ET UNIVERSITÉS

The House divided on Mr Perruzza's motion for second reading of Bill 78, which was tied on the following vote:

Il y a eu partage des voix pour la motion, proposée par M. Perruzza, pour la deuxième lecture du projet de loi 78 :

Ayes/Pour-27

Abel, Boyd, Cooper, Coppen, Dadamo, Duignan, Frankford, Gigantes, Haeck, Hansen, Harrington, Jamison, Johnson, Mammoliti, MacKinnon, Mills, O'Connor, Owens, Perruzza, Silipo, Ward, M., Waters, Wessinger, White, Wilson, G., Wiseman, Wood.

Nays/Contre-27

Arnott, Beer, Bradley, Brown, Callahan, Caplan, Cordiano, Cousens, Cunningham, Daigeler, Drainville, Harnick, Haslam, Hope, Jackson, Martin, McLean, McLeod, O'Neill, Y., Runciman, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Tilson, Villeneuve, Wilson, J., Witmer.

The Deputy Speaker: This makes the role of the Speaker very interesting, I think. It is the first occasion I have to do so in the time I have sat in the chair.

My responsibility is to vote in favour of the vote. Let me explain. It is not my responsibility as a Speaker to kill a bill. It is the government's responsibility at a later date to bring it back and debate it again. Hence the reason for my support of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 94(k), the bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, we would ask that it be referred to the standing committee on social development for public debate. This is too important to put in the committee of the whole House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the majority in favour that it should go to the standing committee on social development?

All those in favour will please rise.

All those opposed will please rise.

A majority of the House not being in agreement with the request of the member, this bill is referred to the committee of the whole House.

Mr Sterling: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I know the vote has been taken, but I think it is important to note

that all of the majority came from the New Democratic Party. The Liberals and the Conservatives wanted this out to committee, and because the record does not show that, it is important that be on the record.

The House recessed at 1222.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The House resumed at 1330.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

MONTFORT HOSPITAL
L'HÔPITAL MONTFORT

Mr Morin: Today is a very special day for the residents of Carleton East. The Montfort Hospital is the best hospital in Ontario. Today marks the launch of its community outreach campaign, entitled *Cordialement vôtre/Sincerely Yours*, working towards its goal of \$3.5 million. This is the first fund-raising campaign in the hospital's history.

À date, Montfort a déjà accumulé au-delà de deux millions de dollars sous forme de dons gracieusement offerts par le personnel, les malades et les bénévoles de l'hôpital et aussi par des entreprises financières, ainsi que d'autres organismes.

Established in 1953, Montfort is a community hospital with 252 beds. It is recognized as a leader in the provision of bilingual health care services. Montfort serves the communities of Gloucester, Ottawa East and Vanier as well as the surrounding rural areas. L'Hôpital Montfort serves the largest concentration of francophones in Ontario. The funds raised by the *Sincerely Yours* campaign will go towards phase 2 of a major redevelopment project.

I would like to recognize the co-chairs of this fund-raising campaign, Raymond Gélinais and Agathe Bélisle, and also the efforts of Roger Légaré, foundation board chairman, as well as the other members of his committee. Last but not least, I wish to acknowledge the efforts of Gisèle Richer, the director of development at Montfort and also campaign co-ordinator.

I wish Montfort great success in this fund-raising drive.

PLANT CLOSURE

Mr Arnott: I want to inform the assembly, and specifically the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology and the Minister of the Environment, of an extremely urgent and serious matter affecting 130 workers in my riding of Wellington.

Recently, Canada Packers Inc announced its intention to close its Stillmeadow Farm processing plant located in Pilkington township near Elora. The effective closure date is 14 June 1991. In a written statement, the company's management indicated the reasons for closing the plant were as follows:

"The Elora facility is an older plant with an inefficient layout and no land base for expansion. A further difficulty is a recent concern of the Ontario Ministry of the Environment over the plant's handling of waste water. The combination of these factors, along with the company's intention to expand its value added poultry processing, resulted in a decision to relocate the product lines and integrate them into our Brantford plant."

If the provincial government does nothing and this plant is allowed to close in six weeks' time, it will be a

devastating economic blow to Wellington. Many of these workers will be unable to find work in the short term. Very few will be offered jobs at the company's Brantford facilities.

Personally, I want to express my sincere disappointment at the company's decision to close Stillmeadow Farm. I call upon the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology to immediately review the decision by Canada Packers and take whatever measures are within their power to ensure that these 130 workers do not face a bleak summer of unemployment.

ONTARIO SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS'
ASSOCIATION

Mr Sutherland: I rise today to give recognition to an outstanding organization in this province. The Ontario Secondary School Students' Association, better known as the OSSSA, has been providing leadership training to high school students for 15 years.

The OSSSA, which is made up entirely of students, is organized on the basis of 12 regional presidents and a premier, who make up the cabinet. Each regional president is responsible for organizing a leadership conference for the student council leaders in that region.

Around 1,500 students will attend the 12 conferences in this school calendar year to improve their communication skills, consensus-building skills, and develop a greater sense of the responsibilities associated with being an effective leader.

Many of the OSSSA cabinet leaders have gone on to be leaders in other areas. They are now entrepreneurs, managers, school board trustees, and there are even a couple working here at Queen's Park.

I chose today to speak about the OSSSA because it marks the seventh anniversary of one of the OSSSA's most significant accomplishments. On 2 May 1984 the OSSSA hosted a student Parliament right here at Queen's Park as part of Education Week celebrations in the bicentennial year. Some 125 students, each from the riding he or she represented, came to Toronto for four days to gain an understanding of how parliamentary democracy operated in Ontario.

With next week being Education Week, I think it is extremely important to recognize the OSSSA for its ongoing commitment to developing leadership skills and repeatedly demonstrating that our education system is full of excellence.

CROSS-BORDER SHOPPING

Mrs Caplan: I have an important quote to share with the House: "The Ontario budget has added a further nail in the coffin of border communities." That is how John Millson, chairman of the Ontario Border Communities Mayors' Task Force on Cross-Border and Sunday Shopping sums up the effect of this government's increases in gasoline, alcohol and cigarette taxes on border communities.

I am shocked by the fact that this government has totally ignored the repeated calls by municipalities for solutions to this border shopping crisis, solutions such as a

graduated gasoline tax and reduction in provincial sales tax, reasonable solutions which the mayors of Windsor, Sault Ste Marie, Sarnia, Fort Frances and Prescott told the standing committee on finance and economic affairs would reduce the devastating impact of cross-border shopping and help stimulate our provincial economy.

Through its gasoline tax hike of 1.7 cents a litre, the government expects to raise revenues. In fact, the Treasurer is doing the reverse. He is encouraging and luring Ontario residents to the United States to do their shopping. According to the mayor of Sault Ste Marie, Joe Fratesi, this government has done nothing but "amplify the problems of cross-border communities." But it is not just a few that are in jeopardy; all communities will soon be feeling the damage.

This government must take leadership and be a full working partner in taking immediate action.

ONTARIO BRANDY

Mr Runciman: The Ontario government has a very specific policy for aiding our wine-growing region through the purchase of surplus grapes produced by Ontario vineyards. This helps to keep Ontario farmers in business so that they do not sell their precious farm land to developers.

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario also has very specific policies. One of these policies is that it bottles and sells its own liquor products. One of these products is brandy. Rieder Distillery of Grimsby purchases surplus grapes from the provincial government. This helps to keep the cost of this assistance program down. Rieder then produces brandy from these grapes.

I know that members are probably thinking what a wonderful thing this is, that the province helps farmers by buying grapes, the distillery helps the province by buying the grapes from the province and the LCBO helps the distillery by buying and bottling the brandy produced.

I hate to burst the bubble, but this is not the way it works. True, the province buys the grapes. True, the distillery buys the grapes. True, the LCBO bottles and sells brandy. False, the LCBO buys this brandy from the distillery. Nope, that would be too simple. The LCBO goes to France for its no-name hooch and ignores the thousands of gallons of quality Ontario brandy available right outside its own back door.

I suspect most Ontario residents assume that if a bottle of liquor at the LCBO has the LCBO label, it is an Ontario product. If the LCBO is going to put an Ontario crest label on a bottle, then why does the minister not ensure that it really is an Ontario product?

MIDWIFERY

Ms Gigantes: This coming Sunday 5 May is the first time that the work of midwives will be recognized on an international level. In Ontario, International Midwifery Day will be marked by celebrations in Toronto, Ottawa, Thunder Bay, Sudbury, London and Stratford.

When this Legislature approves Bill 56, An Act respecting the regulation of the Profession of Midwifery, it will be the first Legislature in Canada to acknowledge the role of midwifery in childbirth. It will be an advance in

health service that many thousands of women have worked to see, and over many a year.

We prize the wonders of modern medical technology, modern pharmaceuticals and modern clinical methods, but we have also come to understand that it is possible for the medical model to become too much of a good thing.

In the case of childbirth, this fact has been more than obvious to women for many unhappy decades of child delivery. In fact, the predecessor to this Legislature in Upper Canada was the scene of several early battles about who owned childbirth—women and their preferred attendants, midwives, or the medical profession. The payment and even the practice of midwifery by non-physicians was effectively outlawed in the late 1800s, and it has taken over a century for the profession to be honoured.

I am proud to invite members of this Legislature to join in recognizing the work of midwives around the world on Sunday 5 May.

1340

LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr Sola: As all members of the House will be aware, there were produce trucks lined up on the Queensway as far as the eye can see today and yesterday because their entrance to the Ontario Food Terminal is being blocked by picketers.

There are several producers, dealers and buyers whose entrance to the food terminal is shared with Oshawa Foods staff, and their path is being blocked despite the fact that they, as employers, have nothing to do with the picketers.

One employer in my riding, Van Fliet Brothers Florists, is being shut out of the terminal, and its produce, with a life of a day, is in danger of becoming useless. They have not done anything which would cause a picket against them, yet they are being hurt none the less and their access to earning a living is being blocked.

Shortly after noon today, frustrated produce buyers and sellers began staging a protest drive around Queen's Park. They are angry that they have become innocent victims in the labour dispute. In a time when people are losing jobs and companies are going bankrupt, it is unbelievable that this government would allow this dispute to threaten more jobs in viable companies.

The government must act today to ensure that Van Fliet Brothers and others buying and selling at the food terminal have access so they do not lose tens of thousands of dollars in income and so hundreds of thousands of dollars of produce does not go to waste today and every day this picket continues.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mrs Cunningham: I was disappointed that the Treasurer's budget did not include anything meaningful with regard to skills training in the province. The three recommendations from Vision 2000 that were included are just the tip of the iceberg. We need a fundamental overhaul of our community college system to meet our labour market needs and to sustain the province's industrial competitiveness.

We have heard nothing from the Minister of Colleges and Universities and of Skills Development on this issue.

He has not announced curriculum reform to provide a common set of generic skills so that a worker can adapt to a variety of career paths, even though we have been told that today's workers will have to be trained for three or four careers during their working lives.

He has not announced any initiatives to deal with declining enrolment in technology programs, despite the fact that there is increasing demand for these graduates. He has not dealt with the issue of apprenticeship-journeyman ratios. He has not announced a program to promote the role of colleges in the provision of customized contract training services for companies. Humber College's successful Business and Industry Service Centre could serve as a model, yet still we have heard nothing.

He has not commented on the ideas of centres of specialization as a cost-effective way to get state-of-the-art equipment into our colleges. He has not announced measures to speed up the process for the development of articulation agreements or new high school guidance measures to attract students into the technology fields.

There is so much more that could be done to meet our skills training needs; we need the determination and political will to do so.

BUDGET

Mr Mills: Last night I was in Ashburn, a small community in my riding, to attend the ratepayers' meeting. This ratepayers' association boasts 200 members, and they are committed to saving the environment. They applaud the attempts of the Treasurer in the budget to address our environmental concerns. I am bringing this up in the House this afternoon to advise the leader of the third party, who is not here, and the members of the third party that they do not have a God-given right to oppose the budget on behalf of everyone in the province of Ontario.

Further, I would say that on 6 September the people of Ontario showed their distaste for the third party and its policies by their non-support through the polls. The buses Taxfighter 1 and Taxfighter 2 came back to Queen's Park empty of the elected people they thought were going to come here.

Given these circumstances, I am finding the behaviour of the third party in its tactics to hold up the debate of this budget, lacking any mandate from the people of Ontario, diabolical.

In closing, I wish to convey to the Treasurer the support of the constituents in my riding who are public servants and applaud the fact that the recession is not being carried on their backs.

Interjections.

The Speaker: A lively beginning to the afternoon.

REPORT OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I beg to inform the House that I have today laid upon the table a report from the Honourable Gregory T. Evans, commissioner on conflict of interest, regarding the Honourable Frances Lankin, Minister of Health and Chairperson of the Management Board of Cabinet.

Hon Ms Ziemba: I request all-party consent to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. Do I have approval?

Agreed to.

ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Hon Ms Ziemba: As a Polish Canadian, I stand today to rise on the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. Tomorrow, 3 May 1991, Poland and all people of Polish descent around the world, including myself, will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of a historic day for Poland and everyone in the free world, the signing of Poland's first official Constitution, the first written Constitution in Europe.

In 1791 a group of reform-oriented members of Parliament, joined by the King, designed a plan for the collection of political rights, the declaration of freedom and human rights and the renewed structure of state authorities. On 3 May, these supporters of the reform gathered in full force and the Constitution was quickly, unanimously and enthusiastically adopted, sworn by the King and members of Parliament.

The Constitution introduced the division of parliamentary powers into executive, legislative and judicial branches. A mechanism for amending the Constitution was created and religious tolerance was reaffirmed. Peasants were assured of protection under the law and the national government.

The 3 May Constitution was remarkable for its time in several ways. It was proof of the Polish nation's drive towards individual and national freedom which had manifested itself throughout history, and it was adopted without violence, unlike its counterparts in the United States, in 1787, and in France, in 1791.

Tomorrow, Poland, with its newly regained republic, celebrates the memory of its first legal Constitution and the sound spirit of the nation. The people celebrate the recent democratic election where they chose the man who led them in the overthrow.

Polish immigrants have continuously struggled for democracy on this continent. In 1609, Polish immigrants first made their home in North America, in Jamestown, and in 1625, when Polish immigrants were refused the right to vote, the first strike in North America was held. As a result, they got the vote.

In 1857 Ontario became the home of many Polish immigrants fleeing from the German oppression and landing in Renfrew county. They brought with them the tradition of democracy and are proud to live in a country that has been guided by the principles of democracy.

Today, as a Polish Canadian I am reminded of those struggles and I am reminded of the fact that many countries around the world are still striving for democracy and their own Constitution, and we hope for their success.

I would also like to mention the fact that we have our consul general from Poland sitting in the audience.

1350

Mr Ruprecht: May 3 is of special significance to citizens of Polish ancestry who are today and tomorrow, and

indeed on the weekend, celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

The Constitution of Poland, already 200 years ago, guaranteed a great deal of personal freedom and, for the first time in Europe, divided the authorities into the legislative and controlling body, the Parliament; the executive body, the ministers; and the independent judiciary, the courts. For the first time it really diminished a great deal the royal power and the power of the oligarchy.

Today, I am delighted to introduce to the House some Canadians who were ready to lay down their lives for a democratic Poland. The acting consul general, Mr Smyk, was already introduced to the House. With him is Stan Sadowski, president of the Canadian Polish Congress, Toronto District, and Mr Szczyglowski, president of the Polish Combatants Association.

This year the anniversary is of special significance, not only because Polish Canadians celebrate the 200th anniversary, but also because it is a symbol of great significance to the recent events in Poland, where a simple electrician belonging to the first independent trade union of eastern Europe can become the president of Poland and where a Canadian from Mississauga could actually run and do well in a country called Poland. That, to me, speaks a great deal about the democratic tradition of the Polish nation.

As the House knows, in 1981, just a few short days before martial law was declared on 13 December, I had the pleasure of meeting Mr Walesa who today, of course, is president of Poland. At that time, the Russian army was poised to take over Poland and there was a great sense of belief in a free and democratic Poland by Mr Walesa and the independent trade union and, indeed, millions of Poles.

I can remember what Mr Walesa said to me just a few days, in fact, before he was incarcerated by the former Communist regime. He said: "I will be going to jail but I will not leave Poland, as the regime wants me to go into exile. I will stay in Poland and fight for a democratic Poland even if it means death."

Our meeting was interrupted by two men when they came into the office. They brought with them a fairly large cross and, while our meeting went on, they nailed the cross over Mr Walesa's chair. When the people left, I asked him what the significance was. He said to me: "This is our faith. This is our nation. This is what we believe in. This really is our Constitution."

I remind the House that today, as the community will celebrate Polish Constitution Day, all of us should somewhat remind ourselves to remember the kinds of events that are going on in Poland and, indeed, all of eastern Europe today.

What will the scribes of history say to this Canadian nation, or indeed to this assembly? Will they say, "Here was a nation which participated in the reconstruction of a country that has again won its democratic tradition"? Or will they say, "Here is a lucky people, unable or unwilling to put their shoulder to the wheel and try to help reconstruct a country, which will be necessary for the rest of eastern Europe to do well"?

So I remind all my friends today, let's do our part as we think about our own Constitution today. The choice is ours and I would hope we will try to help and not sit idly by.

Finally, 3 May will be celebrated by Polish Canadians and all those who would like to participate on Sunday at 11 o'clock with a mass at St Casimir's Church on Roncesvalles Avenue. Then there will be a prayer service at the Katyn monument at the foot of Roncesvalles and King Street and there will be other events.

Let me simply turn to our Polish Canadian friends and say to all Canadians, let's all celebrate the Constitution of 200 years ago that started a democratic Poland. Let's all help the Polish nation.

Mr Cousens: On behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative caucus, a very special welcome to the consul general and guests who are here today in the Legislature.

There is a popular Polish saying that a cat which wears gloves will not catch a mouse. Throughout their long history Poles have not shown any timidity in baring their claws to struggle for Polish democracy. Few nations can rival Poland's history for the oppression and horror it has met and the democratic victories it has won from these struggles. It is perhaps important that as a fellow democracy, we should honour the Polish Constitution's bicentennial as a reminder to us, a country which has not suffered such difficulties—yet.

Poland has much to teach us. Poles began to democratize their state while most of the world remained in rigid tyranny. As early as 1605 a Polish parliamentarian, Jan Zamojjeski, could declare that the king reigns but does not govern. The early Polish Parliament, the Sejm, was unique in demanding unanimous consent to pass all its legislation. Though our government backbenchers and opposition MPPs might envy such power, the Poles were still not happy with it and chose, as we must, to draft a better Constitution in 1791. To do this they wanted the best, and having no fear of the free trade of ideas, they chose the great French philosopher Rousseau to write it. Typically for Poland, this Constitution was achieved without bloodshed or threat of secession but from a passionate desire to make Poland better.

This democratic spirit has endured to this day, a remarkable achievement given the horrors visited upon Poland. In this century alone, Poland has endured three wars, the hideous evil of Nazi Germany and 46 years of Stalinist socialism. The centuries-old traditions of Poland's democracy have remained resilient to all adversity.

The Poles were the first to resist Nazi Germany in 1939. They were among the first to resist communism and the first to rid themselves of that oppression. In the last year they were able to revive their democracy and restore cherished democratic traditions. Once more the royal Polish eagle graces the flag of a free Poland. As Poles say, "Poland has not yet fallen while we still live." We should all remember this as we have seen the symbols and the traditions of our nation treated in such a cavalier fashion of late.

The Speaker: I wish to thank all honourable members who made their very thoughtful comments on this very

special occasion and to mention to Mr Smyk, the acting consul general for the Republic of Poland, that we would be most pleased to send these remarks in print along to you in short order. You are most welcome to our gallery today.

1400

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Hon Ms Akande: Yesterday I informed the House of some initiatives undertaken by my ministry to get the process of social assistance reform back on track. I provided the House with details of a \$48.8-million package of back-to-work initiatives and a \$30.5-million job creation fund which will help social assistance recipients find employment and reduce their reliance on social services. I announced that we will be establishing opportunity planning pilot projects to help social assistance recipients develop personal plans to help them find employment.

Today I would like to provide further details on the balance of the \$215 million earmarked for social assistance reform announced by the Treasurer earlier this week.

Members will recall that the Treasurer described the \$215-million reform package as having four objectives: to provide benefits to those in greatest need; to help people get into the labour force; to increase fairness and accessibility, and to assist municipalities with their funding responsibilities.

Yesterday I described those initiatives designed to help people get into the labour force. Today I shall outline how we will address the other three objectives. Of the \$215 million announced in the budget for social assistance reform, we will be allocating about \$166 million to meet these ends. About one half of the total funds for reform, or \$111.5 million, will be allocated to initiatives to provide more assistance to those in greatest need. For example:

A list of special necessities such as wheelchairs or respiratory supplies will be identified and their provision made mandatory under the General Welfare Assistance Act and the Family Benefits Act.

Access to general welfare assistance will be offered to battered women in need who are forced to leave the family home because of abuse. Assistance will be provided for three months. Extensions will be possible in exceptional circumstances.

Sole-support parents, who typically spend a few months on general welfare assistance before being transferred to the province's family benefits program, will receive the higher family benefits allowance from their first day on social assistance, rather than the lower general welfare rate. This will not only provide greater benefits to single parents, but it will also provide a benefit to municipalities, as the allowance will be paid 100% by the province.

Our next major initiative will increase the fairness and accessibility of the social assistance system, which is a vital support to the stability and security of people. It is important that people who need assistance not only feel that they can get it when they need it but that they are treated fairly, and \$39.2 million has been allocated to this end.

In recognition of the fact that many people speak a language other than English or French, services and materials offered through the social assistance program will be made available in a number of other languages.

All boarders, regardless of whether they are living with family or in a boarding home, will receive the same higher rate of assistance.

The government will also be acting on two very important recommendations from the 1988 SARC report that were repeated in Back on Track.

These recommendations call for the establishment of a council of consumers made up of social assistance recipients who will monitor the system and provide advice to the government. We will also examine various market basket approaches that are designed to compare the adequacy of social assistance rates to a market basket of common products and services. We are committed to determining which market basket approach is most useful.

As part of the \$215-million social assistance reform initiatives, we are allocating \$16 million to improve and promote first nations' control of social assistance. This is in direct response to the report of the first nations communities project team which accompanied the Back on Track report.

The action plan for the first nations will develop rules for social assistance that are more appropriate and sensitive to the first nations and better reflect the cost of living in the remote communities. The plan will also address the need for improved training and support for administrators and will encourage native persons to get involved in the delivery system.

All of the initiatives address the needs of the recipients of social assistance and of the communities in which they live. This government is also sensitive to the cost pressures which the municipalities have experienced during this recession.

Thus, for this fiscal year, this government will be making it easier for some municipalities to qualify for additional provincial funding. Municipalities will receive 90% funding instead of the traditional 80% from the province when their welfare case load exceeds 3.5% of their general population for a period of four consecutive months. This 90% funding will apply only to that portion of the case load above 3.5% of the population. This will mean \$12.4 million in extra funding to municipalities this year, which is separate from the \$215 million of ongoing reform initiatives.

Furthermore, the sum of all of the Back on Track action items that are being adopted by the government will result in a saving to municipalities of \$12.6 million this year, for a total of \$25 million in additional assistance to municipalities.

What I have outlined over the past two days are the first steps towards an improved and updated social assistance system. This government acknowledges that more needs to be done. The Back on Track report identifies other problems within the system, and this government fully intends to address all of them, but making this task more difficult is an unco-operative partner in Ottawa. Ontario is being severely hurt by the federal government's cap on the Canada assistance plan. Indeed, Ontario stands

to lose more than \$1 billion in federal transfer payments this fiscal year alone.

Yet despite this federal withdrawal of support for persons in need and the strain of growing case loads, this government is renewing its commitment to people and is moving ahead with social assistance reforms. As the Treasurer indicated in his budget of last Monday, the social assistance system is an essential part of Ontario's social safety net. It is a vital support to the stability and the security of our economy. Approximately 40% of the people who rely on social assistance are children. There should be no question that these initiatives are an investment in Ontario's future.

Furthermore, social assistance reform is one of many measures we are taking to address poverty. Our recent measures include: lowering taxes for low-income earners with dependent children; introducing an employee wage protection program; providing another 10,000 non-profit homes, and improving the support and custody and enforcement system.

The progress on social assistance reforms as described in the announcement today would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of my Advisory Group on New Social Assistance Legislation and its March report, *Back on Track*. I look forward to the group's next report on the development of new social assistance legislation.

I said it yesterday and it bears repeating today: The important process of social assistance reform is back on track.

1410

HEALTH INSURANCE

Hon Ms Lankin: Today I would like to elaborate on the changes that are being made to Ontario's out-of-country payment policy for hospital services, and I want to pay tribute at this time to the former Minister of Health, my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre, for her work on this matter.

As the Treasurer outlined on Monday, we are committed to effectively managing the cost of the health care system and ensuring access for the people of Ontario to the quality services that they need.

Current out-of-country payments far exceed our provincial rates. For emergency cases, currently Ontario pays 100% of the amount billed for hospital services. For services unavailable in Ontario, Ontario pays 100% of the amount billed for hospital services. For other elective cases, Ontario pays 75% of the amount billed for hospital services.

The ministry is amending the rates paid by our Ontario health insurance plan for hospital treatment outside of Canada. The new policy will bring Ontario in line with most other provinces and will adhere to the standards set in federal health legislation. The new rates will reflect the rates being paid in this province.

For emergency cases, we will now pay only Ontario per diem rates for hospital services. Private insurance pays the rest.

For services unavailable or unavailable in a timely fashion in Ontario we will provide, with prior approval,

coverage at 100% of preferred provider rates. These rates will be negotiated with selected facilities in the United States.

For elective cases, we will pay only Ontario per diem rates for hospital services. These rates will only cover part of the cost for Ontario residents who go to the United States strictly for elective treatment. These people will have to pay the remainder of the costs themselves, since private insurance would not likely be available to them.

I would like to make it clear that the changes being implemented will not cut off access to out-of-country services for those seeking services which are not available in Ontario or are not available in sufficient time. The ministry will cover the full costs that are negotiated for these people after the need has been approved by the ministry.

The ministry will be conducting an extensive public information campaign to advise travellers to purchase supplementary health insurance so that they are fully covered in case of any needed emergency treatment.

Of course, cost control is not our only concern. We also wish to improve the quality of health care services in Ontario. For this reason, the ministry will expand and enhance programs and support systems which will assist those patients currently needing to use out-of-country treatments.

These will include expansions of existing addiction services: residential programs, youth services, case management, detoxification services and day treatment, as well as an enhancement of assessment and referral services. A new treatment registry is planned as well. Expanded hospital and community services for acquired brain injury patients in a variety of areas, such as rehabilitation, home care and supportive community living, are also included. Further measures will be taken to improve health care services as savings are realized.

Our government believes the health care system in this province should be accountable to its consumers and to the taxpayers who support it. The amount of money currently being spent on out-of-country hospital services does not ensure that the health of Ontario residents is improved.

I will soon be announcing more details on the implementation of this policy, and we expect the program to be in place this fall.

By making these necessary changes to our out-of-country payment policy, we believe we are responsive to the needs of consumers while acting as prudent administrators of the public's money.

RESPONSES

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr Phillips: The statement of the minister today I think is indicative of a concern I have expressed in the House; that is, that this issue was raised months ago and now finally we are getting a response that will not be implemented fully until the fall. There will be at least \$200 million worth of Ontario taxpayers' dollars that will flow to the US because we have not moved to implement this.

I am very discouraged. I sent the Premier a letter outlining our concern that the Minister of Health is now a part-time Minister of Health, and that there are about eight

or nine major issues in the Ministry of Health that require the full-time services of a Minister of Health, whether it be on long-term care reform or community-based care reform or northern health care reform, on the Lowy report, the hospital act or health professions legislation.

I would hope the Premier would reconsider his decision to have a part-time Minister of Health because, as I say, \$200 million of Ontario taxpayers' dollars will flow to the US as a result of the delay in action on what is an obvious problem—and the solution, it seems to me, is rather obvious.

In terms of the specifics of the recommendations, I would raise a few issues with the Minister of Health. Perhaps she can clarify them when we see the details.

The first concern is that as Ontario residents who heretofore have been insured find they are not insured, I would hope, as she says in her statement, that there would be indeed a very comprehensive communications program.

The second thing is that we would appreciate knowing the prior approval process she will be following. I realize it is a broad-brush statement, but who will be responsible for the prior approval?

Also, there is a concern, I think by all of us, about a two-tiered health care system. In her third recommendation, elective surgery will be available outside Ontario for those who can afford it. All of us, the minister particularly, must be diligent that we do not end up in Ontario with a two-tiered health care system where those who have money will go elsewhere for it and those who do not will stay here. Particularly in the elective surgery area, I would hope we monitor that carefully.

Finally, the details of her programs to expand head injury treatment and for alcohol and drug treatment are not in here. We will be looking forward to those shortly.

My major concern, particularly to the Premier, is that I would hope he would reconsider his decision to have a part-time Minister of Health. I think the former Minister of Health could confirm that it is a full-time job requiring the full efforts of a minister.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Beer: I rise to respond to the statement by the Minister of Community and Social Services. What is of most concern to us on this side of the House is what is not here and what is not stated. Remember, this is a government that was advised by its advisory committee to add \$450 million for social assistance reform. Less than half of that was in the budget, and the minister would want us to know that in this fiscal year, when the recession is at its worst, only \$158 million is being spent.

The second point that is critical to point out here is that we know that there are two—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Stop the clock, please. There seems to be a little misunderstanding about the standing orders. This is response time. It means response by one person at a time.

Mr Beer: The other thing the minister would know is that improving the benefits to social assistance recipients is one of the most immediate and direct ways of providing

help and ensuring they have funds in their pockets. There was nothing yesterday, nothing today, nothing in the budget about improving benefits. There was nothing today or yesterday or in the budget about improving the minimum wage. What we need is action in those areas, action that was called for by the advisory committee.

Clearly, the biggest disappointment in what has been announced today and yesterday by the minister is the section on municipalities. We know municipalities have been saying for months now that they need real help. What is here is really quite laughable, \$12.5 million, when we look at what the budgets are for municipalities around the province: Hamilton \$75 million; Windsor \$34 million; Ottawa \$140 million.

What the government is supposed to be doing is answering the Provincial-Municipal Social Services Review Committee report, answering the Hopcroft report. Those reports are there. Is the government going to accept taking over the municipal share of welfare? We know nothing from today's statement in terms of what direction they are going to go in, and the kind of help municipalities are told they are going to get will be of very little use.

Finally, the minister said children and child poverty are among the biggest issues, but nothing has been brought forward today or yesterday to deal with child care, to deal with the questions of the children's benefit. All she has done is attack the federal government. We need to see some action. What the minister has to do is to find the track, let alone get back on it.

1420

HEALTH INSURANCE

Mr Harris: I want to respond to the statement by the part-time—

Mr Sorbara: Surely the critics should be doing the responses.

Mr Harris: There seems to be great consternation that our Health critic unfortunately cannot be in the House today. I think I can respond on his behalf.

I want to respond to the statement by the part-time Minister of Health in the House today and I want to respond directly. I concur with the comments of the member for Scarborough-Agincourt on all of the things that need to be addressed in the health care system that are not being addressed and that are not being dealt with. Unfortunately for the member for Scarborough-Agincourt, a lot of the problems were built up by his party when it was in office. However, I think he is sincere and I think he brings forward good points that this minister and this government should be looking at.

I want to talk specifically about a few concerns I have with the statement today. It is very late in coming. This matter has been raised by our Health critic, the member for Parry Sound, for well over a year now, particularly with regard to drug rehabilitation in the United States. I see nothing today in the minister's statement that says services in the United States can only be accessed on a direct referral by a physician here in Ontario. There is nothing on that.

This question was asked by our critic in the past. The former minister said she assumed that was the case.

However, when we checked with officials in the Ministry of Health that was not case. We have seen example after example where people can go off to the States and access services without any referral from a doctor here in Ontario. In Ontario, you cannot get a blood test, you cannot get any lab work done, you cannot get a prescription and you cannot get anything to access the system in Ontario without being referred by a physician or somebody qualified to bill the system.

Why, then, is that control not in place for people accessing similar services in the United States? I would suggest to the minister that I am most disappointed she has not addressed that in her statement today.

Second, I guess the minister is saying that in a number of these cases, for emergency cases we will now pay only the Ontario per diem rates for hospital services; private insurance pays the rest. So if you do not have private insurance, then presumably what she is saying is that she is going to rely on user fees either to purchase the insurance or user fees for people to pay the difference when this is the only course that is available for emergencies.

We in this party have consistently called for an appropriate discussion on user fees. We are opposed to those who are least able to afford them having to pay them. However, she continues to bring in universal user fees for ambulance services, and now universal user fees to access emergency services, and only the poor will be hurt by this.

I also share the concern of the Liberal Party that we are heading into a two-tiered health care system. She says that for elective cases she will pay only Ontario per diem rates for hospital services. Given the backlog for elective procedures in this province—the waiting lists are getting longer and longer—what in essence she is saying is: “The rich can go get it anywhere in the world they want. We will pay the OHIP rate for that.” But the poor, unless they can pay the user fee, will simply languish, wait, potentially die on waiting lists here in Ontario. Again, we are heading down the track for a two-tiered health care system.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Harris: I have taken longer than I wanted to because we want to comment on the other statement. Let me just express as well my disappointment in the statement of the Minister of Community and Social Services. There is nothing in her statement about helping those unemployed employable people on welfare or on other assistance to get a job and to get back to work. There is nothing in anything here about getting back to work.

ORAL QUESTIONS

BUDGET

Mr Conway: My question is to the Treasurer. It concerns the revenue projections and the budgetary data which flow from the revenue projections of his budget.

I would like the Treasurer to help me understand in the first instance the revenue projections for fiscal 1991-92. In the Fiscal Outlook and Review paper he states he anticipates and plans for, on page 51, personal income tax revenues in fiscal 1991-92 of \$15,975 million. Can the Treasurer confirm that to get that PIT revenue he has built

into the PIT base the \$930-million windfall that was received by Ontario in fiscal 1990-91?

Hon Mr Laughren: No. To the best of my knowledge the extra PIT that was received in 1990-91 was attributed to the 1990-91 revenues.

Mr Conway: Treasury officials have confirmed that the government has built into its revenue base the \$930 million in windfall revenue that was happily received in 1990-91. Will the Treasurer confirm that in this House, and would he then also comment on how he could possibly do that in light of the recessionary wreckage that is everywhere about the Ontario economy and much commented upon in his Fiscal Outlook and Review.

Hon Mr Laughren: I misunderstood the member in the first part of his question. The money that flowed to Ontario that was above what was anticipated is not what I would call a windfall.

Mr Scott: You used to call it a windfall.

Hon Mr Laughren: That is simply not true. What happened was that the federal government underestimated what the revenues would be to Ontario based on the income tax collection agreement. The income tax from the previous year—do not forget, this was based on the 1989 tax year—was higher than was anticipated, but that does not mean by any stretch of the imagination that it should be termed a windfall. It was what was due to the province of Ontario because of our tax-sharing agreement. Finally, of course, yes, that amount of money is built into the base revenue for the province.

Mr Conway: My point in raising the question is obviously to get to the bottom line, which is the projected deficit of \$9.7 billion for fiscal 1991-92. I would respectfully submit to my honourable friends opposite that the only way they can keep the deficit to below \$10 billion is to assume altogether overly optimistic revenue projections which, I would state respectfully, they have done.

Would the Treasurer not agree that it is optimistic to a fault to imagine that in 1991-92 personal income tax revenues are going to be anywhere near \$15,975 million, and that a much more realistic estimate would be to put those revenues at somewhere around \$15 billion which will, I would bet, produce a real in-year deficit of not \$9.7 billion, but much closer to \$10.6 billion, and perhaps close to \$11 billion?

Hon Mr Laughren: I hope not, because I know the member who asked the question is as aware as I am of how embarrassing it is when you are overly optimistic on what your revenues will be. All I can say to the member is that these are the best forecast numbers we can come up with. We do not come up with the numbers out of the air. These are done in consultation with the federal government. We would be very foolish to put out a set of bogus numbers, because we are going to be judged on how well we meet the forecast and how well we are able to contain the deficit to that number. So no, there was no attempt to inflate that number for any reason whatsoever.

JOB CREATION

Mr Offer: My question is to the Treasurer. In his budget, he claimed he is running a \$10-billion deficit in order to create 70,000 jobs. On page 39 of the budget document, there is a table which claims that the manufacturing recovery program will have an employment impact of 3,000 jobs. Yesterday the minister responsible announced this rehashed loan program, which is aimed at preserving jobs at ailing manufacturing companies. Why did the Treasurer include these 3,000 jobs in his job creation statement when they are not new jobs at all?

Hon Mr Laughren: I guess we could have a debate about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, but I want to tell the member I am talking about jobs too. I hope the member would agree that we need to have the manufacturing recovery program in the budget as a program that we intend to carry out in this next year, partly because of the severity of the recession and partly because we believe we are still the manufacturing heartland of this country and we want to make sure we are well placed as the recovery occurs.

Very often these are manufacturing companies that are going to be strategically crucial as we move into a new era of high value added employment and high value added manufacturing. It is our view that if we did not have this \$57-million program, those jobs simply would not be there. This is a program that is going to make sure those 3,000 jobs are here in Ontario this year.

Mr Offer: I listened closely to the response of the Treasurer and I hope he would agree that when one states that there are going to be 70,000 jobs created in a budget, one would be able to find in the budget the creation of 70,000 jobs.

On page 39 of the budget document there is an item called additional fiscal support, which claims that the NDP is spending over \$6 billion to create 47,000 jobs. According to the Treasurer's own officials, this \$6 billion will include funds for the 6% wage hike for civil servants, a wage hike for doctors, new furniture for government offices and even includes payments to those hundreds of thousands of people on social assistance rolls. This is information given by the Treasurer's officials. Given these facts, can he now point out one job that this \$6-billion fiscal deficit will create?

Hon Mr Laughren: I hope the member would agree that if we had not run a substantial deficit this year, there would have been an enormous amount of unemployment in this province, a lot more than there is now. I will give an example.

Mr Elston: You're not helping at all.

Hon Mr Laughren: Let me give an example. In other jurisdictions—

Mr Sorbara: Why does only your spending create jobs?

Hon Mr Laughren: If the members opposite would stop yapping for two minutes, we might have a serious debate in this assembly.

Mr Speaker, the—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Laughren: It is all yours.

The Speaker: While certain vocabulary does not strike my ears very well, at the same time I had observed that a very serious question was posed by the member and a very serious response was in the process of being presented. It would be very helpful if the Treasurer could be allowed to continue his remarks.

Hon Mr Laughren: In other jurisdictions, when a decision was made not to run up a deficit but rather to cut back, it meant sacrificing thousands of jobs. My government and I believe that in the middle of a severe recession our obligation is to protect and create jobs, not simply to sit on the sidelines and watch the recession go by. That was our intention and that is what we will accomplish this year.

Mr Offer: The Treasurer stated in this House, in his budget on page 4, the three last words of the fourth paragraph, "creating 70,000 jobs." We all understand what he is trying to do. He is trying to deflect the criticism of this crippling deficit by claiming that he is using it to fight the recession. But it is clear, even through his previous responses, that he is not creating new jobs in this budget at all. There is no new job creation program.

Aside from the anti-recession fund, can the Treasurer point to one job that will be created in this \$10-billion deficit, and if he cannot, why did he state that he was creating 70,000 jobs when in this budget, in this document and all attached documents, there is not one single job that has been created?

Hon Mr Laughren: The member opposite can discount the importance of the \$700-million anti-recession package if he wants. Most of that will be spent in 1991-92. The member can devalue the entire housing program, 10,000 units as stated by the Minister of Housing. The member opposite can stand in his place if he likes and say if we had not had a substantial deficit—would he tell me there would not be 70,000 fewer jobs in this province if we had not done that? I think he is wrong.

VISITORS

The Speaker: Before moving to the third party for questions, I have stopped the clock and members might wish to welcome to our midst this afternoon two former members of the Assembly: Lorne Henderson, the former member for Lambton; and Frank Faubert, the former member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

JOB CREATION

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Treasurer. On Monday and in response to questions in the House this week he has told us that this outrageous \$10-billion deficit—admittedly, "outrageous" is my word; he does not think it is outrageous—was to create 70,000 new jobs. Could the Treasurer tell us the breakdown in the industrial or commercial sectors where these new jobs will be created?

Hon Mr Laughren: I am sorry. I really did not catch the question.

Mr Harris: The Treasurer said the reason for the \$10-billion deficit was to create 70,000 new jobs. Can he tell us the breakdown in the industrial or commercial sectors where these temporary jobs will be created?

Hon Mr Laughren: First, I think the leader of the third party should understand that in this party we do not believe we can spend our way out of the recession. Second, unlike many of his counterparts, we believe that the government's role is to have an economic climate in which business and competition can thrive and that, as we come out of this recession, we are well placed for a different kind of economy as we head through the 1990s. We believe we are going to be headed for a high value added, high-wage economy and we are making sure we do not destroy the infrastructure as we head for that. I can tell the leader of the third party as well that if the leader—

Mr Sorbara: You haven't done anything for steel. You haven't done anything for aviation. You haven't done anything.

1440

The Speaker: A question was posed by the leader of the third party, not the member for York Centre. Had the Treasurer finished his response?

Mr Harris: I think this is an important matter for us. This \$10 billion in deferred taxation has been clearly stated by the Treasurer and by the Premier yesterday in response to questions. The reason for it was to fight the recession by creating 70,000 jobs. I am trying to find out where these jobs are and what they are. On Tuesday I pointed out to the Treasurer that these 70,000 jobs, according to his estimates of \$10 billion, were costing taxpayers close to \$140,000 per job. Since the Treasurer cannot tell us where they will be created, could he tell us what the average wage for these 70,000 temporary jobs will actually be, and how long he anticipates that these jobs will last?

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, I do not know why the member insists on calling them temporary jobs. Second, if he looks at the chart on page 39 of the budget he should be able to understand that of the \$700-million anti-recession package—does the member really think that a lot of those 18,000 jobs that were created were not private sector jobs? Those capital works projects were a major stimulant to the private sector. I know the member opposite would rather not see that happen. He would rather see that the private sector not be given that kind of stimulus through our capital spending program.

We are not prepared to walk away from our obligation to maintain the capital infrastructure in this province. We believe that those schools need to be rebuilt, the hospitals need to be expanded and the roads need to be improved. Almost that entire commitment involves private sector jobs. Surely to goodness the leader of the third party understands that.

Mr Harris: Let me try again with the Treasurer. I want to get this straight. All estimates are that the private sector is losing 200,000 permanent jobs this year. What I want to know is, what is he replacing them with? He says the \$10 billion is creating 70,000 jobs. Is he saying they are not temporary? But they are conditional on a \$10-bil-

lion deficit. Is the Treasurer telling me then that if they are not temporary, but they are conditional on a \$10-billion deficit, he plans to continue this \$10-billion deficit for these 70,000 jobs ad infinitum? I suggest to him they exist as long as he has a \$10-billion debt. That is what he told us. This is his budget, not mine.

I ask the Treasurer again, can he tell us whether these jobs are in the commercial sector? Can he tell us whether they will be in the industrial sector? Can he tell us the average wage for these jobs that were costing \$140,000 per job to provide?

Hon Mr Laughren: I will try once again. I thought it was very clear in the document on page 39: anti-recession spending, 18,200 jobs. I do not know precisely how many, but an enormous proportion of those jobs will be in the private sector because that is who does the construction jobs. It is not the public sector that does the construction jobs; almost invariably the private sector does those jobs.

If the member looks at the manufacturing recovery program—that is 3,000 jobs—we estimate that most of those, virtually all of them, would be in the private sector because it is in the manufacturing sector. If he looks at social housing—new initiatives, that calls for 600 new jobs. Presumably those jobs would be in the private sector as well.

If he looks at tax relief—no retail sales tax on the GST or on the Ontario current cost allowance—for heaven's sake, we are told all the time by the private sector that if we provide those kinds of relief, they create the jobs as a result of that relief. The member cannot have it both ways. That is exactly what they tell us all the time.

Mr Harris: There is one person and one person alone in this province who thinks that the government is providing relief for the private sector to be able to compete in this province, and that is the minister.

I give up on the Treasurer. My second question is to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

Yesterday Ken Harrigan, the chairman of Ford Motor Co, confirmed that jobs will be lost in St Thomas and Windsor as a direct result of this budget. Since the Treasurer was unable to give me a firm indication, will the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology tell me if he knows how many of these 70,000 temporary jobs will be created in the automobile sector?

Hon Mr Pilkey: I do not agree that jobs will be lost by the increase in the gas-guzzler tax, which I believe, if I am correct, was initiated in 1989 by the Liberal government. This is simply an expansion to that.

We have, through my ministry, met with the Ford Motor Co and with General Motors. We have been very supportive to both of those companies. We encourage increased employment—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Minister, we are back into the part where there are certain questions we do not like and certain answers we do not like. We may take a break.

If members are a little more relaxed now, including the member for Etobicoke West, whose leader is waiting to hear the response, we can continue with the response.

Hon Mr Pilkey: Just to conclude, the tax will affect less than 1% of the vehicles made in Ontario. I suppose the extent to which that might impact on employment levels is open to speculation. It would be my hope that it would not, and it would also be my hope that the very proactive agreements and involvement that we have with automotive companies in this province will allow them to continue to proceed and prosper.

Mr Harris: First of all, I am disappointed, but I understand that the whole budgetary philosophy, the whole job creation strategy, is this Tinkerbelle: "I hope. I just wish it would happen." Unfortunately, that is not how things happen in this province. One cannot wish them to happen.

The minister is telling me that he thinks, somehow or other, that dramatically increasing the price of Marquis and Cougars and Thunderbirds will not affect the sales and the jobs for those products. I disagree, the company disagrees and every economist disagrees.

Surely the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology must know how this budget impacts on the industrial sector. Surely he asked the Treasurer how it would help stop the massive layoffs that are occurring. Now let me ask him this: How many of the 70,000 temporary jobs will be available to laid-off workers in the wool, yarn and cloth industry or in the wood industry or in the textile industry or in the rubber products industry or in the beverage industry? Will any of the 70,000 temporary jobs benefit some of these 200,000 that will be laid off in these industries?

1450

Hon Mr Pilkey: As the leader of the third party well knows, this Ontario budget will have a broad impact, and it will impact on a variety of sectors. If he is asking me—or, I suspect, any member of the House, including the Treasurer—specifically how many jobs in each individual company or sector it will impact, I think that is not likely to be forthcoming. What will be forthcoming is a positive impact generated by this budget that is going to attack this recession in a very positive way and help bring companies to a more preferred situation than they are now in.

Just by way of example, this very morning I made announcements in Oakville to three companies that are expanding through their research and development, creating employment in this province and helping to lead us in this new technological age. This budget will help us continue to do that.

Mr Harris: Yesterday, in response to a question about the \$57-million assistance package to help "fundamentally sound," the minister said, small and medium businesses—leaving aside the argument that was proven yesterday that this is not a new program, not new money, that in fact he is cutting back on this kind of money because he has flatlined his budget, as we saw in the estimates, the minister said that expenditure of \$57 million will save 25,000 jobs. Could I ask the minister—and I am just trying to establish the credibility of his budget—does it make sense to him that this \$57 million of existing money will save 25,000 jobs, so that leaves us 45,000 jobs for the other \$9.65 billion of deficit financing this year? Does that make sense to the minister, that he and his program can save

25,000 with \$57 million, but the Treasurer needs another \$9.65 billion to save 45,000 other jobs?

Hon Mr Pilkey: What would make a great deal of sense to me is if the leader of the third party here would start to get his facts straight. That is what would make a lot more sense to me.

Had he been listening to the minister's statement that I made in this House—and I will read it to him again because he obviously was not listening the first time—I said that it is estimated that these targeted companies employ some 25,000 people. Quite frankly, I am quite willing and able to the best of my ability to respond to these questions. But these sort of "half circumstance"—and those are the best words I can use in the House—are somewhat annoying, and I wish the leader of the third party would quit using those kinds of comments that are not accurate and not what I said.

BUDGET

Mr Conway: I would like to go back to the Treasurer, and I would refer him to the chart on page 15 of his budget entitled "Medium-Term Fiscal Outlook."

For the Treasurer to contain his debt over that four-year period, fiscal 1991 to fiscal 1994, to \$34.8 billion, he by his own estimates will have to move provincial revenues from \$43 billion to \$57 billion. That assumes an annual growth in revenues of 9.8%. That, as the Treasurer will know, is a very generous annual growth in revenue at a time when his own officials and his own budget are predicting average annual gross domestic product growth at 7%.

In light of the historical patterns in the Ontario economy and in light of the rather effective historical assumptions of many of his very good people in Treasury, how can the Treasurer at one and the same time predict an annual growth in provincial gross domestic product at 7%, and anticipate annual revenue growth of 9.8%?

Hon Mr Laughren: These numbers he is using, are absolutely correct, which does not surprise me, I might add. But I think the member should understand that in order to achieve those revenue numbers, which in turn will allow us to achieve the deficit that we want to achieve, or do even better than is in the documents, it is going to mean a combination of growth in the economy, at the rates referred to by the member opposite, and new taxes that will be raised during those periods.

A couple of things should be said: One is that I believe revenues were growing at almost a 10% rate during the last number of years; and I do not know of any government anywhere, if it does any medium-term fiscal planning, that does not build into it revenue increases in order to achieve its objectives.

Mr Conway: One of the things that has impressed me about the Treasurer's budget document is, as I say, what the recession is doing to a lot of the tax sources, particularly the corporate tax and the retail sales tax. That is why I have to assume that there are good people in Treasury who are saying privately, if not publicly, that in fiscal 1991-92 personal income tax revenues are going to be well below the nearly \$16-billion assumption.

My question to the Treasurer is this: If the Treasurer were to take, over that four-year period, the normal assumption by which his officials operate, that revenue growth will be 90% of projected gross domestic product—and by 1994-95, instead of \$57 billion worth of revenue we would be at \$52 billion of revenue—would he not agree that a reasonable assumption is that he is anticipating minimally a \$5-billion tax increase to maintain, at the very best of all other assumptions, the integrity of his \$34.8-billion deficit projection over that four-year period?

Hon Mr Laughren: The table that is in the budget document is a scenario that the member has interpreted accurately. However, a word of caution would be that there could be any number of models put out there based on growth assumptions, based on revenue moves that will be made over that period of time. It is very difficult to project with any kind of accuracy, when you are that far down the road, what the growth of the economy is going to be like, and what particular tax moves we will be making.

As well, I do not know to what extent the expenditures that are in here are going to be as high as we indicated. If the expenditures in here are less than what is in the budget document, then of course that will allow us to have lower revenues or pay down the deficit or whatever. But I would just caution members to regard the table on page 15 as one of any number of models that one could use in trying to arrive at a medium-term fiscal plan, and that is exactly what we have done.

SOCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr Jackson: My question is to the Minister of Community and Social Services. The minister will be aware that immigration officials are currently investigating a situation where there is an allegation that there are up to 100 Nigerian refugee claimants who have been accused of abusing our social assistance system. It was reported in the Toronto Sun this morning that some of the claimants are receiving up to 13 separate payments from welfare offices each month. One case is even reported in this article in which apparently one individual has only been in the country for six months and has purchased a \$15,000 car with cash.

These abuses are obviously costing taxpayers thousands of dollars. There are legitimate concerns at this point as to just how much abuse there is in our welfare system. Could the minister be more specific with respect to the number of taxpayer dollars involved or the number of recipients who are abusing the system? Can she share that kind of information with this House?

1500

Hon Ms Akande: I thank the member for the question. I want to begin this question with a very definite statement. I would not want us in any way to convey information that many people or the majority of people defrauded the system. The reality of the picture is that when the Transitions report came out, the research around that said there was only about 3% of fraud by recipients and much of it was not deliberate, and there were as many people being underpaid as there were being overpaid. That is first, because I know we really would not want to as-

sume that about many people on social assistance. The other thing is that the general welfare assistance benefits are administered by the municipalities, not by the province. However, we do cost-share and therefore we are concerned. It is also interesting to note that this level of fraud was picked up by the workers, the staff who are involved in GWA, and because we have increased staff and because they are doing monitoring and counselling, they have been able to identify this.

[Applause]

Mr Jackson: I find it passing strange that on the eve of a budget with a \$10-billion deficit the NDP caucus is applauding non-intentional fraud.

The point I raise is, just what is the nature of the minister's monitoring? To suggest that the SARC report, which is now three and a half years old, somehow has an accurate handle on this situation—I would remind the minister that the SARC report specifically identified deficiencies in which this government of this province determines the exact extent of fraud. It goes further to recommend that her ministry should be responsible for implementing accountability and monitoring systems.

It is clear that the minister has been attracted to certain of the recommendations that would allow for no longer having a home visit, for example, which is what the very workers she referred to used to determine some cases of fraud. She has removed the right to have a permanent address in this province which those very workers used as a means of ensuring that taxpayers' dollars were protected.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Jackson: My question is, do not confuse the issue of increased payments. We want the minister to put in place an accountability system. When will she have—

The Speaker: Will the member take his seat, please?

Hon Ms Akande: Was there a question? Let me say to the member, do not confuse the answer. The answer is clear. The accountability system is there. It is monitored by the increased number of workers. We have workers now working—he does not want to hear the answer.

Mr Jackson: That line worked with Judge Evans. It does not work in this House. What do you say, fraud is okay if you are ignorant of the law?

The Speaker: I had difficulty hearing the response and the cause of the volume was the very member who was waiting to hear the response.

Mr Jackson: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I did not even know you were on your feet because of the members opposite yelling at you.

EDUCATION POLICY

Mr Malkowski: My question is to the Minister of Education. I was interested today in noticing an article in the Toronto Star. I have the article here with me. The headline said that Ontario is set to skip out of national school tests and the article discussed the issue that we will not be participating in the national school tests sponsored by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. I would like

the minister to address that issue and explain why we are not interested in participating in that.

Hon Mrs Boyd: I too was interested that this was considered news, since the meeting at which this decision was conveyed to the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada took place in February. We decided not to become involved in the national indicators project as a participant, but only as an observer, because we object to the way in which the project is being carried out.

We believe that in order to give us the kind of information that will help us to improve our curriculum and our methodology with respect to the effectiveness of learning, such testing needs to be based on curriculum. Despite my pleas to the contrary, my fellow ministers would not agree to design the tests in such a way that they took account of the curriculum that is being offered in the provinces.

The other issue for us was that we believe, from the kind of research that we have done, that the kind of standardized testing they are proposing is very prejudicial to groups that have demographic areas. So we are not prepared to take part in it, since they would not guarantee a sample that followed the demographic curve of Ontario.

Mr Malkowski: I would like then to ask the minister what she does plan to do to ensure accountability and quality of education in the province of Ontario.

Hon Mrs Boyd: We have already embarked on a project called the benchmarks project, which is a four-year project begun by the previous government. We are carrying it on. That will be a project that will examine what children are supposed to have learned at each level. Initially it will be developed for grades 3, 6 and 9. We have hired on secondment Burl Summers, who is currently the director of education in Hastings county; and as a field development co-ordinator, a woman named Gail Rappolt, who is going to be on secondment from the Hamilton Board of Education. That work will begin on 1 September 1991.

SCHOOL TRANSFER

Mr Mancini: My question is for the Premier. He will be aware that the former government worked for 24 months to find an acceptable accommodation agreement for the public and separate school boards in Essex county. For the Premier's benefit, I want to remind him of the agreement that was announced to the community of Essex and budgeted for by the previous government. That agreement provided two new schools, one for the west end and one for the east end of the county.

In January the current Minister of Education, in a remarkable display of managerial incompetence, swept aside 24 months of work and cancelled the agreement. This is how we arrived at the present and unfortunate situation in Essex county today. The Premier's government's decision means that Amherstburg is about to lose its only community school, contrary to the spirit of Bill 30.

Why has the Premier taken away legally budgeted funds from the school boards of Essex county? Why has he done this?

Hon Mr Rae: In light of the question, I am going to direct it to the Minister of Education.

Mr Mancini: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: This matter is so sensitive and has created so much social turmoil in Essex county, we need and are expecting leadership from the Premier of Ontario. The question is for the Premier.

The Speaker: The member knows quite well that under the standing orders any minister to whom a question is directed has the opportunity to redirect the question. That is precisely what has been done. The question is for the Minister of Education.

Hon Mrs Boyd: I am distressed that I continue to be misrepresented in terms of my position and our government's position with respect to the school accommodation issue. We have not withdrawn the funding allocation made by the previous government at all. The issue was that the Villanova school could not be built in Essex county because of exactly the same kind of pressure that is occurring now. Citizens who want to block the provision of extended Catholic education in that part of the province have taken the province to the Ontario Municipal Board to prevent the building of the school on the ground that was bought for that purpose.

It was when the courts upheld that finding of the OMB that the school boards in the area were faced with an issue of what to do. They cancelled the sharing agreement at General Amherst District High School, which had pertained for some four years, and it was our responsibility as a government and my responsibility as a minister to go and encourage them to find a local solution to this problem, so that all the children in Essex county would have access to the education they are mandated to have.

Mr Mancini: It is against the rules to call the minister a liar, but her nose is growing.

Interjections.

1510

The Speaker: I do not think I am the only one who has read the story of Pinocchio. I think the member might want to rephrase.

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, are you asking me to withdraw that?

Mr Jackson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: The Chair can only entertain one point of order at a time. I am dealing with the member for Essex South. I think the member knows full well the implication of the remark which he made and I would ask that the member consider a rephrasing of his remark.

Mr Mancini: The minister is out to lunch completely. Interjections.

The Speaker: The government House leader.

Hon Miss Martel: I think you made it very clear that the remark should be withdrawn and I did not hear him withdraw that remark.

The Speaker: I did not hear that magic word either.

Mr Mancini: Mr Speaker, I will withdraw anything that is offensive to you.

During the Bill 30 debates, all three parties made a solemn promise to single-school communities. The Premier

in a press release dated 20 February 1986 vowed that the NDP would continue to press, "To ensure protections for public schools in single-school communities." Those were the Premier's words.

His Minister of Housing, the member for Windsor-Riverside, was equally impassioned at the time. This is what the member said in the Legislature on 9 July 1985 "Anyone who understands rural communities in southwestern Ontario will know that in Essex county, for example, there are several small urban areas, each of which has its own public school, each of which is proud of its school, which is the focus of the community, and each of which wants its school to be maintained."

Somehow we have to come to grips with that issue, whether it means sharing facilities or, as the member for Windsor-Riverside said, some new facilities.

The Speaker: The interrogative part?

Mr Mancini: Yes, Mr Speaker. Whatever the end solution, we have to respect the needs and desires of the small communities throughout the province.

Through the minister's direct interference in January, she has contravened the Education Act and I want to know why she broke the solemn promise that was made by the NDP and her caucus colleagues at that time. The second part of the question is, since she has refused so far, will she be prepared to meet with a delegation of local officials from the community, since her Premier has said he runs an open government?

Hon Mrs Boyd: The member is quite right that it is very difficult for single-school communities when they are faced with the kind of situation that Essex county is faced with. The public board in Essex county has only 6,950 students enrolled and they have over 10,000 spaces. The taxpayers of Essex county are telling us that they are not prepared to try to support that kind of a situation.

I have not in any way made a decision. We have used the processes that were set up by the previous government in terms of the Planning and Implementation Commission, and the negotiated settlement that was done was done with the agreement of the two boards. I have not yet had the recommendation from the PIC. When I do, a decision will be made, given the recommendation that the commission makes.

This is the process that was set up by the previous government, and I find it disgraceful that the member is criticizing a process that his own government set up in order to try to resolve these kinds of issues without the kind of conflict that he has continually tried to build on in his own area.

Mr Stockwell: The disgraceful part is that the government kept making those promises and it did not want to fulfil them.

TAX INCREASES

Mr Stockwell: A question of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: Why did he not request the Treasurer, during budget deliberations, rather than increasing the gas-guzzler tax on large cars, to do something with some incentive to help boost that sagging industry, to help

boost the car manufacturers and the car sales, and help boost an industry in great need? Why did he not request the Treasurer, rather than slapping an increased tax on top of cars, to remove the tax on small cars, thereby creating an incentive for people to buy and also accomplishing his environmental concerns that he suggests were part of making this decision? Why did he not put that to the Treasurer?

Hon Mr Pilkey: The Treasurer and myself, through my ministry, do meet with the automotive industry. We are very supportive of the automotive industry. They are in fact key to the wealth and health of this particular province. We have, as well, involved ourselves in financial programs to do just that.

In terms of what the Treasurer had on one particular program in his budget, if the question is, did I discuss that with presidents of motor companies? I did not. I am prohibited from doing so and could not divulge the contents of that budget to them or anyone else.

Mr Stockwell: First, that was not the question; the question was very clear. I cannot believe the minister cannot talk to presidents of major car companies in this province, asking for their input into a budget that is devastating an already very fragile industry in this province. He knows he can talk to them.

The question was, why did the minister not go to the Treasurer and ask him to remove the tax on small cars? He knows full well it would have been far better for the consumer, for the car industry, for the employees who are going to get laid off due to this particular announcement, and it would have solved the government's environmental concerns.

My feeling is that he is simply gouging the taxpayers again for tax dollars to run up the government's \$1-billion tax increases and its \$10-billion deficit. The minister should come clean with the public. Why did he not make that move? It would accomplish exactly the same thing and would not put this fragile industry at even greater risk. Why? That is the question. He should try to answer it.

Hon Mr Pilkey: This government has been and continues to be and will be well into the future very supportive of the automotive business in this province. In terms of any—if I understand the question—specific consultations they may have had with the Treasurer relative to his specific budget, the member will have to ask him.

1520

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Mr Ferguson: I have a question for the Minister of Labour. I know all members of the House will be concerned about the answer.

Between 1964 and 1975, a number of injured workers in this province received pensions as a result of permanent disabilities. However, due to an insensitive Liberal government and an uncaring Conservative government those pensions were not indexed. The problem today is that we have a situation where we have individuals who have been permanently disabled for a number of years receiving only \$200 a month in pension. What does the Minister of Labour plan to do to help these individuals?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I can tell my colleague that this issue has been put in front of me by a number of injured workers' groups across the province. I can also tell him that, on checking, I have been absolutely appalled at the extent of this particular problem. I have talked to the new chairperson of the board. We have asked him to report to us on this matter and tell us specifically what measures he is prepared to take to deal with the pensions of older workers from the Workers' Compensation Board.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

Mr H. O'Neil: My question is of the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The tourism sector is describing this budget as a bitter blow to its industry. They say it will chase away tourists and, at the same time, destroy thousands of jobs. Tourist operators say they are getting no assistance from this budget, with not one mention of tourism in the entire budget speech. They feel they are in no position to swallow more tax hikes; rather they need assistance from this government. Instead of assistance, the budget of the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation as the percentage of total government expenditure has actually declined. Can the minister tell us why this government has decided to abandon the tourism industry in this province during these tough economic times.

Hon Mr North: I appreciate the question. I can tell the member that the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation, on behalf of this government, is doing a number of different things for the tourism industry. Actually, I spoke to the members of Tourism Ontario as recently as two days ago, the day after the budget.

We spoke at some length about all the different problems that they were having with the recession and problems that they felt should have been addressed in the budget. I can tell the member that they were disappointed and they made that perfectly clear to me. I spoke to them on a number of different incentives and they were very pleased with that. They told me that for the first time an attack was made on the budget but not on the minister.

Mr H. O'Neil: I can tell the minister that we do not agree with what he has just said and I do not really believe the tourism industry does either. The government has upped the tax on gasoline and it upped the tax on liquor—two of the things that are very important in the meal component and everything else. The tourism industry, made up of many small industry people, is very concerned and the minister has not done a thing to address the problem it has. Instead of telling us what he has talked about, will he tell us what he is going to do to help these people keep in business.

Hon Mr North: I will take the opportunity to tell the member some of the things we have done. The lunch I had the other day was a very good opportunity for me to announce a couple of different things we had planned on doing.

One of the first things I announced the other day, as a matter of fact, was a program called OTEC, which is Ontario Tourism Education Council. They were very pleased to hear that we are putting in the moneys as a startup cost for this program. A second thing that I announced the other

day is the fact that we are putting in three brand-new ad agencies instead of just one. We will be doing that so that we can cover the market better with better quality information. One of the other things we talked about was that we will be looking at having a competitiveness forum, which I believe is the first in the province or in the country. I think these are good incentives.

I can tell the member across the floor that they were very pleased that there was no increase in workers' compensation, that there was no tax as a result of the wage protection fund and that there was no increase in the employer health tax.

Mr J. Wilson: My supplementary is to the Treasurer. To underline the effect the budget has had on tourism operators, I will read from the head of the union, Jean-Guy Bélanger, president of the local of the hotel-restaurant employees union, where he says: "We are putting our prices up and chasing the Americans away. Why would Americans come here when they pay double for their drinks and hotel rooms?"

How could the Treasurer possibly, after meeting with Tourism Ontario some three weeks before the budget, totally ignore its pleas for lower taxes? His deficit will drive up the Canadian dollar, will drive up interest rates. Why did he not respond to the needs of Tourism Ontario and the thousands of tourism operators across this province? I want a direct answer for that since the minister fails to give us one in this House time after time when we ask him.

Hon Mr Laughren: I will try to respond to the very serious question from the member opposite. I appreciate the fact that there are parts of the tourism industry that are suffering, just as there are aspects of every sector out there. We should not forget that we are in the middle of a very serious recession. I would say to the members of the third party, though, that if they are looking for solutions, at least partly, to the problems in the tourism industry, they had better take a look at what their friends in Ottawa have done in the last few years. The members opposite—

Mr J. Wilson: You don't care about the second-largest employer. Shame on you.

Hon Mr Laughren: I understand what the member is saying, but what he has to understand as well is that he and his colleagues cannot, day after day, come into this place and call for more expenditures of one kind or another at the same time as they are calling for lower taxes, at the same time as they are calling for a lower deficit. I do not know how anybody, unless he was a magician, could do something like that. I really do not understand it, but perhaps some day the members of the third party will explain to me how they would weave that kind of magic in Ontario.

VISITOR

The Speaker: The members may wish to welcome to our midst another former member of the House, the former member for Ottawa Centre, Michael Cassidy.

Mr Conway: I do not know why people continue to do this, but our friend is not just the former member for Ottawa Centre. Lest it be forgotten, he is a very colourful

star in the pantheon of social democracy, a former leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party.

The Speaker: I thank the member.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr Jackson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You were called upon to give a ruling during an exchange between the member for Essex South and the member for London Centre. I, like all members of the House, heard that exchange and was witness to the reference by the member for London Centre, who said she was quite distressed at the member's misrepresentation of the fact. You then ruled solely on the fact that the member for Essex South said that the member for London Centre's nose was growing.

Mr Speaker, I would ask you to review Hansard and to examine why today you have one ruling for the governing party, of which you are a member, and another ruling for members of the opposition. I would ask, sir, given that that phrase has been ruled upon in this House on several occasions, that you would be fair in your interpretation and, more to the point, if you would review Hansard and either call for the removal of the statement of the member for London Centre or offer up an apology to the member for Essex South. But, Speaker, please be consistent.

The Speaker: To the member for Burlington South, I am always pleased to review Hansard. I will do so and I will report back to the member later.

1530

PETITION

ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

Mr Runciman: I have a petition, prepared by the United Pentecostal Church in Brockville, petitioning the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly. This really addresses the congregation's concerns in respect to the decision by the socialist government to extend benefits to same-sex couples.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT, 1991

LOI DE 1991 POUR PROTECTION ÉCONOMIQUE DE CITÉ DE NIAGARA FALLS

Mr Harris moved first reading of Bill 94, An Act to protect the economy of the Border Community of the City of Niagara Falls.

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 94, Loi pour protection économique de la communauté frontrière de Cité de Niagara Falls.

1537

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

La motion de M. Harris, mise aux voix, est adoptée :

Ayes/Pour-79

Abel, Akande, Allen, Arnott, Boyd, Bradley, Buchanan, Callahan, Caplan, Carter, Charlton, Christopher-son, Conway, Cooke, Cooper, Cousens, Drainville,

Duignan, Elston, Farnan, Ferguson, Fletcher, Frankford, Gigantes, Grier, Hansen, Harnick, Harrington, Harris, Haslam, Hayes, Henderson, Hope, Jackson, Jamison, Johnson, Jordan, Klopp, Lessard, MacKinnon, Mackenzie, Malkowski, Mammoliti, Mancini, Marchese, Marland, Martin, Mathysen, Mills, Morrow, Murdoch, B., Murdoch, S., North, O'Connor, Offer, O'Neill, Y., Owens, Philip, E., Phillips, G., Ruprecht, Silipo, Sola, Sorbara, Sterling, Stockwell, Sullivan, Sutherland, Turnbull, Villeneuve, Ward, B., Ward, M., Waters, White, Wilson, F., Wilson, G., Wilson, J., Winninger, Wiseman, Witmer.

Nays/Contre-3

Bisson, Haeck, Wessenger.

Mr Speaker: The Minister of Housing.

Hon Mr Cooke: Mr Speaker, I move that the House do now pass to orders of—

Mr Speaker: Sorry. The table is required to make the reading. My apologies.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: This is a bill entitled An Act to protect the economy of the Border Community of the City of Niagara Falls/ Loi pour protection économique de la communauté frontrière de Cité de Niagara Falls.

The Speaker: Mr Harris.

Hon Mr Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: It is an introduction of a bill and it is normal practice to allow the person who introduced the bill to make a brief opening remark at first reading. The leader of the third party.

Mr Harris: In the absence of the House leader, who might know the rules better than the acting House leader—although given his experience I would be surprised—I would like to point out to members of the House, particularly to those who voted against the bill, that the purpose of this bill is to protect the economy of the border community of the city of Niagara Falls, by ensuring that government-imposed costs do not undermine the competitiveness of firms in said community.

The Speaker: The Minister of Housing.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon Mr Cooke: I move that the House do now pass to orders of the day.

Mr Cousens: Point of order.

The Speaker: Yes, point of order.

Mr Cousens: I take strong exception to the acting House leader of the New Democratic socialist party for standing up now in the middle of proceedings to try to move out of where we are.

Under section 29 of the standing orders of the Legislature, the routine proceedings before the orders of the day are as follows, and we are in normal routine proceedings: We have had members' statements. We have had the statements by the ministry and responses. Today we at least had a chance to talk about a democratic government in Poland, which we are not about to see in this province. We also had oral questions, motions, petitions and reports by committees.

Now we are into introduction of bills, and before the leader of our party can complete further presentations, we find the acting House leader standing up, in his own inimitable way, forgetting the fact that when he was House leader for the NDP, not so long ago, there were a few moments in the history of this House—a “that was then, this is now” situation. The member, who I presume is now playing the role of the House leader for the New Democratic Party in making this motion, has failed to remember his position when he was in opposition and when he was deliberately trying to make a point to the government of the day and when he was opposed to the government of the day trying to change the proceedings of the House to take away that opportunity which the New Democrats were using to make a statement about their position on things.

Mr Drainville: What's your point of order?

Mr Cousens: My point of order has to do with the standing orders of this House. The standing orders of this House, as clearly stated by the Minister of Housing when he was House leader for the New Democrats are: “My understanding is that we have rules that set out the process whereby we get to orders of the day. That is set out in the standing orders, and it would be my suggestion to you, Mr Speaker, that this motion is completely out of order since it is a changing of the standing orders of the Legislature by motion.”

The fact of the matter is that this same person has taken a little trip from this side of the House over here and is now on a bigger trip in suggesting that they are going to run this House and this province without there being a fair opportunity for ourselves, the voice of opposition, to make our statement. We are in the middle of making our presentation of bills. We have missed the opportunity for this person to stand up when it was motions. He had that chance, and now he is coming along and using the House opportunity to do it.

There are a number of other points I would like to table for the Speaker's consideration with regard to the motion by this member. It has to do with things he said in the House on 11 April 1990. That is just over a year ago, so his memory should not be so totally obscured with the power-hungry trip he has had since 6 September that he will have forgotten the lovely things he said in this House when a previous Speaker was given the opportunity to rule on this same kind of motion.

The member for Windsor-Riverside said, “I would also like to express my extreme disappointment at the decision yesterday of the government House leader at moving this motion in the Legislature.” It is the same kind of motion the member for Windsor-Riverside is bringing in today, so when he said last year that he was very disappointed, extremely disappointed, may I say to him and to the whole socialist government how extremely disappointed I am that they are about to use their power in this way.

He went on to say on 11 April 1990: “In making your decision on whether this motion to move to orders of the day is in order, I think you must be mindful, of course, of the government's right to govern, but you must also be

mindful of our right in the opposition to oppose. You must protect both those rights and balance them.” Further to that—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Just a minute. I am always pleased to listen to a member's alleged point of order. The members, of course, are always encouraged to be as brief as they can in stating their point of order. If the member does have a few more items to bring to my attention that are germane to the point he is attempting to make, by all means, and perhaps he would move along.

Mr Cousens: I want to thank the Speaker. There is really something going wrong in the Legislature of the province of Ontario. I appreciate the Speaker allowing me to continue.

The Speaker: Your point of order?

Mr Cousens: In making my response to this motion made by the acting government House leader, in his statement last year there are several pages of his comments when he was giving his point of order to the Chair.

Interjections.

Mr Cousens: Do not try to take away our democratic rights the way they did in Poland during another regime. I am not about to stand in this House and have them come along and take away my rights as a member of the Legislature.

1550

The Speaker: Whoa. Before we get into discussing parliaments around the world, could we kind of focus on today's events? If the member for Markham has information which would assist the Chair, I would appreciate hearing it. I can inform the member, first of all, that it really is not necessary to re-read anyone else's speech. I am quite familiar with the contents to which he refers from 11 April 1990.

Mr Cousens: I have made the point and I will move to other issues that I have to table before this House, but I want it to be very clear in the minds of those who are new to this House, and there are many people—not including yourself, Mr Speaker, because you have served here for other terms—who are not aware of the fact that it was just over a year ago that the same person who stood up then to defend the rights of the opposition has now stood up as government House leader to take away the rights of this party.

I would also like to point out that the former Speaker, when he ruled on this issue, took into consideration the fact that our standing orders are not especially clear on this issue and, in trying to draw a clear, fair ruling, referred to federal House of Commons rules on the matter. The fact that our own standing orders have no statement on this means you might well be inclined to look at standing order 1(b) that states, “In all contingencies not provided for in the standing orders the question shall be decided by the Speaker or Chair.”

But that does not apply in this case. It explicitly spells out what the order of routine proceedings is in our standing orders. There is no ambiguity or contingencies that are not provided for in the standing orders involved in this

matter. The Speaker does not have any latitude to change this. It is spelled out in the standing orders that routine proceedings, with all its components, be followed before we move to orders of the day.

I believe strongly, in speaking on behalf of our caucus, that the orders of the day under section 29 are very clear. We are in the middle of section 29 of the standing orders. We are in the middle of the introduction of bills, and the acting House leader, in trying to move away from that, is in the process of trying to assign a responsibility to you, Mr Speaker, that you would want to take very seriously.

The former Speaker ruled that as the motion to pass through orders of the day is provided for in the standing orders of the House of Commons, then it is in order for the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. I disagree on that as well. At one time, Ottawa and Ontario may have shared standing orders, which in fact were the standing orders of the British House of Commons, but now we do not. We have developed our own unique set of standing orders which have evolved to suit the needs of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, not the Canadian or British House of Commons.

These are a number of points germane to your considerations, not the least of which is the fairness of the opposition to have an opportunity to make a statement in the assembly of Ontario. Should you rule in favour of the motion by the acting House leader, I believe strongly that you will be taking away the rights of the opposition to be served by the rules of the House and also to serve the needs of the province of Ontario.

The Speaker: First, I wish to thank the member for Markham for his contribution, and I appreciate the fact that he has researched this matter. There are a couple of items which I wish to draw to his attention.

As he has alluded to, on 17 April 1990 Speaker Edighoffer, while faced with a similar situation, gave a ruling in which he found the motion to be in order and gave his full reasons for doing so. Those reasons occupied several pages of Hansard. One portion of it, which may be of interest at this particular point with respect to the last matter raised by the member for Markham, was in reference to the rule he referred to in the standing orders in Ottawa and that the rule had been removed from the standing orders of Ontario in 1978:

"In researching why it had been abandoned, I have satisfied myself that it was mainly because it had never been used. I must conclude, therefore, that this legitimate procedural motion did and can fit into the context of the Legislative Assembly's procedures. In conclusion, therefore, I must find that the motion put by the honourable House leader the other day was in order but, because it has never been used before in this place, I would like to set out for honourable members an exact description of what this motion is, who can move it and at what time."

Those were the words of Speaker Edighoffer at the time. He then goes on to state that:

"The motion that this House proceed to the orders of the day is a tactical motion. It is a procedural motion. It is a dilatory motion. It is not a routine motion. It falls into the same category as motions to adjourn the House and to

adjourn the debate. These dilatory motions have characteristics. They can be moved at any time by any member who legitimately has the floor. As an example of how this works, members will have noticed that the other day the member for Simcoe West moved the adjournment of the House after being recognized in the period reserved for the introduction of bills. That was perfectly in order. The same is true for the motion to proceed to orders of the day. Furthermore, because our standing orders already put a restriction on a dilatory motion, the one to adjourn the debate and the other to adjourn the House, in saying that they cannot be moved until after the end of question period, the same rule should apply to the motion 'to proceed to the orders of the day.' This motion therefore is in order when moved after question period but before reaching orders of the day. The question is put immediately by the Speaker. The bells, if necessary, will ring for a maximum of 30 minutes, and a head count of members present will then take place. It should also be noted that the vote on this type of motion cannot be deferred."

I feel I am in no position other than to abide by the ruling made in similar circumstances by my predecessor, Speaker Edighoffer.

Mr Elston: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: While I appreciate that it is your duty and obligation to be well informed about the rules and previous rulings, I must indicate some surprise that you are in possession of such an extensive and lengthy exposition on this particular matter at a time when it has been newly dropped upon the desk at this early hour during introduction of bills.

I must ask if you have been requested to make this ruling or have been tipped off with respect to the movements of the acting House leader of this particular building. If that is the case, that is certainly a violation of the neutrality with which you have been vested. I understand that it is your obligation to know this, but I find it extremely interesting that you would be armed, possessed fully, with this particular extract. I think it is at least interesting that if you had been advised that this motion was coming, your duty and obligation as a neutral party would be that you inform the rest of us as well, that we might equally be armed and prepared for the motion to be dropped.

It is a very interesting piece of work that has been done today, and while we wish to get on with the business of the House, I must indicate that I had requested information about what the processes were for the day and I expected to be advised so that I could advise my members whether they had to be here for votes, especially votes along these lines, which are unusual, if necessary when people find there are obstructions to the carrying on of government business. I myself was the person, the minister at the time, for whom I think the motion on 17 April 1990's resolution was being processed. I understand that after several days and several hours of dealing with introduction of petitions and all other manner of things, you have to get on with business.

Yesterday we suffered through, and I do say we had to suffer through, a ringing of bells, and it is in fact a very big dislocation of time for members and for the staff. There is

no question about that, and I understand the need to move, but it is a bit of a surprise to me, Mr Speaker, that you were fully anticipating that this should be dropped on the table today after merely one bill being processed in a manner which accorded with that which was carried out yesterday.

1600

My concern is fully, obviously, that we have to do business here—I cannot at all argue about that—and they will do what their numbers allow them to do. But I am a little bit surprised that you would find this in order after but one bill being introduced today, and second, that you would come fully armed with this material when none of the rest of us would have anticipated after one bill being introduced—

The Speaker: To the member for Bruce, whose contributions are always appreciated, there are two points that I wish to bring to his attention. One, it is the responsibility of the Chair to be fully informed at all times as to the activities of this chamber and within this building. The Chair is ably assisted by the table officers, and of course, on a somewhat regular basis, the three House leaders have been most co-operative in informing me of things which they feel should be brought to my attention, for which I am most grateful.

Second, the member for Bruce will know that it is the responsibility of the Chair during either petitions or introduction of bills to exercise the rotation by party around the House. What the Speaker is supposed to do is to start here and look towards the opposition, the third party, the government, back to the opposition, and the Chair does that routinely for the presentation of petitions and introduction of bills. If you would like that procedure changed, then by all means visit the Legislative Assembly committee.

Hon Mr Cooke: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I think it is very unfortunate that the House leader for the official opposition would try to insinuate that there has been interference with the independent office of the Speaker by the government. The fact of the matter is—

Mr Jackson: That isn't your privilege. Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Hon Mr Cooke: I am on a point of privilege.

The Speaker: I am in the middle of the point of privilege, and if the member for Burlington South has a point of order—

Mr Jackson: It's not his point of privilege. It's your privilege, not his.

The Speaker: I will determine whether it is a point of privilege or not after I have heard it.

Hon Mr Cooke: I would simply like to point out to you, Mr Speaker, and to the members of the House that that type of communication did not occur. Obviously anyone with half a brain would have understood after what happened yesterday in the House that we would be looking at the precedents of this Legislature. The Conservative Party anticipated it. Just because the official opposition party did not anticipate it does not mean that there was some conspiracy. So don't be so bloody silly.

The Speaker: Whoa, whoa. The Speaker would very much appreciate it if the Minister of Housing would rephrase his last remark.

Hon Mr Cooke: What did I say that was unparliamentary? Maybe you can tell me what I said. If the word "bloody" is unparliamentary, then "bloody" is added to the list today as well, and I withdraw the word "bloody."

Mr Sterling: Mr Speaker, before you rule on this matter, I have read over the decision that the former Speaker put on this kind of a motion. There was a distinction between that situation and this situation.

In the situation which arose leading to the 17 April ruling, the motion that was placed by the then government House leader came during that part of the routine proceedings dealing with motions. I do not know whether or not that puts a different hue on the matter, but I have read over the ruling of Speaker Edighoffer and, quite frankly, I think Speaker Edighoffer was wrong in his order made on 17 April 1990.

I want to tell you why. April 17, 1990, was about five months after the new standing orders were put into place, which came into place in October 1989. As you were not a member of the Legislature at that time, Mr Speaker, I think it is important for me to tell you and perhaps other members of this Legislature the process that we went through to reach those standing orders. I am not going to be lengthy in this argument, but I want it understood that I think Speaker Edighoffer missed the point when he called this kind of motion a dilatory motion.

When we negotiated these standing orders, which took a period of approximately four years, in which I represented my party, Mr Breaugh, the former member for Oshawa, represented the New Democratic Party and Mr Reycraft, the former member for Middlesex, represented the Liberal Party—in fact, the member for Windsor-Riverside was what I would call a secondary participant in the negotiations from time to time—when we were negotiating those changes, the clear understanding by the opposition parties, then the NDP and the Conservatives, and the Liberals was that the opposition were giving up significant stalling techniques and tactics during those negotiations.

The principal one that we gave up in opposition was the ringing of the bells and the challenging of the Speaker. If in fact those rules were here today, Mr Speaker, we could have at any time during the proceedings stood in our places and challenged a ruling which you had made, caused the bells to ring and not come back in this place until 6 o'clock or a few minutes thereafter. So the opposition parties gave up a tremendous asset in their arsenal of techniques in order to express their displeasure with government policy on any matter.

I want to tell you, Mr Speaker, just as a small diversion from the point of order, that there is no matter on which this party feels stronger than our distaste for the budget which was brought forward by this Treasurer this Monday. Therefore, we are using every tactic that we can to get this Treasurer to put this budget out to a committee so that the people of Ontario can come in and talk about their distaste for this budget.

Back to the point of order. The purpose of giving up the bells and giving up the right to challenge the Speaker was to try to bring more order to this place. When we sat down and put in place the routine proceedings, when the ministers' statements would come, when the parties' responses would come, etc, there was a clear understanding on my part, on behalf of my party, that the government House leader, whoever he or she may be, would not be able to hijack the right of the opposition parties to rely on the procedures of the day, as they were and when they were, in order to use whatever techniques were left, and they were much, much less than they were before the standing orders of October 1989 were brought into place.

I fully understood that the government would have to go through the routine proceedings step by step, and if it could not strike a deal with the opposition parties to mediate whatever the dispute was over the issue, to find another technique to allow opposition parties to voice their opposition over government policy, then the government party had to deal with that matter and had to put up with the opposition that in fact was coming from the other side.

1610

Hon Mr Farnan: The Speaker has already made his decision.

Hon Mr Allen: Mr Speaker, on a point of order—

Mrs Sullivan: He is on a point of order. You can't interrupt a point of order.

Hon Mr Farnan: He hasn't made one.

The Speaker: Is the member for Carleton almost finished?

Hon Mr Farnan: We can't put up with this crap.

Mrs Marland: That is nice language.

Mr Sterling: The Solicitor General says this is crap. These rules, quite frankly, have taken a lot of my time as a member of this Legislature. I have had experience for four years of putting significant amounts of time into these standing orders. I do not consider the standing orders here crap, I do not consider points of order crap, and I think that is despicable language for the Solicitor General of this province to be using in this place.

The Speaker: Do you have anything else to add?

Mr Sterling: Yes, I do. I believe that there are other routes and techniques which the government House leader could put in place, if he or she so desires to do, at other times during the legislative proceedings to get on with the business. If they choose to use them, that would be perfectly in order, in my view. However, I do not view Mr Edighoffer's ruling in this matter correct and I would ask you to reconsider the matter before you make your final ruling.

Mr Callahan: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I feel that as a private member my rights have been infringed upon under section 21(a) and (b) of the standing orders. If I had a motion to present today on behalf of one of my constituents, my motion would in fact be cut off at the pass by your ruling that this action by the House leader of the government is appropriate. It may be that the third party is using this in a dilatory fashion. But if I had a

motion that I had to present for my constituents, your ruling with reference to the attempt by the government House leader to cut us off at the pass would in fact be breaching my privileges. I submit that my privileges have been breached and I would like your ruling on that.

Mrs Marland: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: I have sat here for the last few minutes, hearing a level of language that I have not heard in this House in the six years that I have been here. If anybody who disagrees me would like to research Hansard, they will find that my statement is correct.

Hon Mr Cooke: Margaret, we used to wear a halo, but yours is getting bigger and better.

Mrs Marland: My privileges as a member—if the Minister of Housing, who is now interrupting me, is so hyped as he represents the people of Windsor-Riverside, if he can stand in this House on a point of privilege on behalf of you, Mr Speaker, which is what he said he was doing, then I can stand on a point of privilege on my own behalf.

I would like to say that for a member of the crown, a member of the cabinet of this province—

Mr Stockwell: Representing the Queen.

Mrs Marland: —a member who represents the Queen and a large number of people in this province, to use language such as "bloody stupid" and suggest that another member has half a mind, and then further, for the Solicitor General to stand in this House as the Solicitor General while he represents the residents of Cambridge and say that something—and I quote again—is a lot of crap, frankly I think this government is showing a kind of leadership of which—

[Laughter]

Mrs Marland: I mention at this point, the member who is now laughing the loudest, Mr Speaker, is a—

The Speaker: Is there more to your point of privilege?

Mrs Marland: I am on the point of privilege. The member for Ottawa Centre, who is now laughing louder than anyone in this House—a deposed, former Minister of Health, I might add—who thinks that this is funny, only is a reflection of herself.

Mr Speaker, as a privilege, I would ask that you rule that this kind of language, this kind of behaviour from cabinet ministers or anyone else is simply not to be tolerated in this Legislature.

The Speaker: To the member for Mississauga South, all members will know that the Speaker in fact has a considerable sensitivity to the language which is used in this chamber and that I quite frequently remind members of that. It is very difficult in the sense that we do not have a parliamentary language guide, but my ears are indeed quite sensitive to a lot of words.

I wish to return to the member for Carleton and remind him, first of all, that if there are legitimate points of privilege or order, I am quite happy to hear them. On the other hand, I have made a ruling. I will remind the member for Carleton that it was indeed just yesterday when, during the introduction of bills, there was a motion to adjourn the House. I take it that is completely in line with the ruling

made by Mr Edighoffer on 17 April 1990 and so I have no alternative but to put the question now before the House.

Mr Harris: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party with a point of order and then the Minister of Housing.

Mr Harris: I would try and be very brief on this if I might, Mr Speaker.

Mr Callahan: Point of privilege.

The Speaker: Would the member for Brampton South please take his seat. I am listening to a point of order. I can only listen to one at a time. The member for Nipissing has the floor.

Mr Callahan: Mr Speaker, a point of privilege, with all due respect, takes precedence over any point of order.

The Speaker: I yield the floor to the member for Brampton South.

Mr Callahan: I draw to your attention, Mr Speaker, sections 21(a) and (b) of the standing orders.

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat. You made that point earlier.

Mr Callahan: I have not finished, Mr Speaker. I refer you with all due respect—

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat, please.

Mr Callahan: I refer you to section 21(b). You must deal with it immediately.

The Speaker: Will the member take his seat, please. The leader of the third party.

Mr Harris: I want to add a few words to this to convince you, Mr Speaker, that this is a matter perhaps worth taking under advisement and hearing from those who were involved in the drafting of these new standing orders. I will tell you why.

Mr Speaker, you are quite correct. Yesterday, you made a ruling on a dilatory motion, that being a motion to adjourn. There was ample precedent for that to be considered a dilatory motion, both before and after the standing orders were revised, but I would ask you if you would consider this: There has been one ruling made by Speaker Edighoffer on this type of motion. It was made at a time when it was introduced under motions, which is a little different than today. However, Mr Edighoffer's ruling extended to include this time of the proceedings. There has only been one ruling that has been made on this motion, calling it, classifying it or accepting it as a dilatory motion. We think that ruling was wrong. We would ask you as a new Speaker, in a new session of the Legislative Assembly, before this gets entrenched—after a period of time of two, three or four rulings and precedents that are there, it will then be entrenched as a ruling that will stand for ever and a day.

We think it is a serious matter. We think—and I can recall at the time, because I was in the House when the former ruling was made—that it was not the intent of the House leaders of the day or of the three members of the day of each party who negotiated that this type of motion be considered dilatory.

1620

Mr Speaker, we think as well that the matter is serious enough that, before automatically picking up and treating one ruling as a precedent, you take this under advisement, invite submissions from the three House leaders who were involved in the negotiations and the three members who were involved in the negotiations and reinvestigate this matter.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, to do that because if we just accept Mr Edighoffer's ruling, which we think is wrong today, without having you examine it yourself, without having heard the arguments, it will then be entrenched as a precedent for ever and a day and we think that would be wrong.

The Speaker: Just before the Minister of Housing, to the member for Brampton South, I do owe you an apology. Under standing order 21(b), I needed to respond immediately, which I did not do.

You will be happy to know you have not lost any privileges today, based on the fact that the motion is in order. Had it not been in order, then obviously you would have lost some privileges. I do appreciate the point that you raised and I again apologize for having not responded immediately to your concern.

Mr Callahan: With due respect, I would like to address that particular item.

Hon Mr Cooke: Come on, Mr Speaker.

Mr Callahan: It is still a point of privilege. I am not debating at all. It is a point of privilege.

If in fact your ruling stands as you have made it, Mr Speaker—and I am not challenging it because there is no right of appeal under the standing orders, obviously—it means that any time the Minister of Housing rises in rotation on a routine motion to get right into the business of the House, that means that in fact he could cut me off as a private member from introducing a bill that is important to my constituents.

I am not going to debate what the third party is doing. They are delaying, they are dilatory, and certainly your ruling in that respect would probably make a lot of sense, but I am suggesting that my privileges have in fact been breached, as have all the privileges of the members of this House.

The Speaker: I understand what the member for Brampton South is saying. Indeed, the practice of our House has been, during petitions and introduction of bills, to exercise a rotation around the chamber. Because of that practice, then it allows the opportunity which occurred today and, of course, was referred to in the ruling by Speaker Edighoffer.

Obviously, if members feel that the rules themselves are in need of some repair, then by all means the committee responsible for that is going to have to take a look at it. I think that is along much the same lines as raised by the leader of the third party, who raises a very legitimate concern with respect to how we proceed.

The Speaker is left in a position of using both the standing orders, the practices of this chamber and, where wanting, of other parliaments. The research was done on it

previously by Speaker Edighoffer and I am carrying forward that. I am not unmindful of the most recent point made by the leader of the third party. I can assure him, as I believe I can assure all members of this House, that I take this job seriously and I intend, to the best of my ability, to be totally impartial.

Hon Mr Cooke: Mr Speaker, I would just ask you—

Mr Callahan: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Hon Mr Cooke: I have already asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr Speaker: The Minister of Housing has the floor on a point of order.

Hon Mr Cooke: Mr Speaker, you said a few moments ago that you supported the decision that had been made by the previous Speaker. Part of that decision was: "The question is put immediately by the Speaker. The bells, if necessary, will ring for a maximum of 30 minutes." Mr Speaker, if you have said that this is in order, then I am wondering when you are going to call the question.

The Speaker: The Minister of Housing is absolutely correct. The standing order is there. I am aware of it and I am at fault.

Hon Mr Cooke: I am not referring to the standing order; I am talking about the ruling.

The Speaker: I am at fault for not having called the question immediately. Quite frankly, I did not do so in order to give some members an opportunity to say what obviously was troubling them.

Mr Callahan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The Speaker: This will be the last point of order entertained, because I have made a ruling and we will launch into a vote. I trust that this is on a different matter.

Mr Callahan: Mr Speaker, I challenge your decision on the point of privilege. I appeal that. There is nothing under the standing orders that prevents me from appealing a decision you make on a point of privilege; there is on a point of order. I move appeal of your decision on the point of privilege.

The Speaker: The member may wish to consult the book again.

1658

The House divided on Mr Cooke's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes 60; nays 24.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLY, MINISTRY OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Resuming consideration of Mrs Grier's motion for concurrence in supply for the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr Harris: I move adjournment of the debate.

1729

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 15; nays 72.

Hon Mr Cooke: Mr Speaker, I would call the 50th order.

The Speaker: And Mr Harris has the floor.

Mr Harris: I think I had the floor, but I really believe the Premier and the Treasurer need some time to consider having the public have their say on this budget and therefore I would move the adjournment of the House.

Hon Mr Cooke: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I would just like to point out that after seven months of this party being elected democratically, the Conservative Party refuses to allow the people of this province to have their right—

Interjections.

The Speaker: The motion to adjourn is non-debatable.

1800

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negated on the following vote:

Ayes 14; nays 64.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon Mr Cooke: I will indicate the business for the House next week.

On Monday 6 May, we will have budget debate.

On Tuesday 7 May, we will have second reading of Bill 40, An Act to amend the Mortgages Act, and committee of the whole House on Bill 17, An Act to amend the Law related to the Enforcement of Support and Custody Orders.

On Wednesday 8 May, we will have second reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act.

On Thursday 9 May, in the morning, we will have private members' public business ballot item 17 in the name of Mr Scott and ballot item 18 in the name of Mrs Witmer, and in the afternoon, second reading of Bill 25, An Act to amend the Planning Act, and committee of the whole House on the same bill.

The House adjourned at 1802.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Thursday 2 May 1991

Private members' public business

Responses

Education Amendment Act (Electoral Quotients), 1991, Bill	
72	1125
Mr Tilson	1125
Mr Martin	1126
Mrs Y. O'Neill	1127
Mrs Witmer	1128
Mr Mills	1128
Mr Beer	1129
Mrs Cunningham	1129
Mr Drainville	1130
Mr Callahan	1130
Mr G. Wilson	1131
Mr Tilson	1132
Negatived	1139
Ministry of Colleges and Universities Amendment Act, 1991, Bill 78	1132
Mr Perruzza	1132
Mr Daigeler	1133
Mrs Cunningham	1134
Mr White	1136
Mr Beer	1136
Mr J. Wilson	1137
Mr Mammoliti	1138
Mr Perruzza	1138
Agreed to	1139

Members' statements

Monfort Hospital	1141
Mr Morin	
Plant closure	1141
Mr Arnott	
Ontario Secondary School Students' Association . . .	1141
Mr Sutherland	
Cross-border shopping	1141
Mrs Caplan	
Ontario brandy	1142
Mr Runciman	
Midwifery	1142
Ms Gigantes	
Labour dispute	1142
Mr Sola	
Skills training	1142
Mrs Cunningham	
Budget	1143
Mr Mills	

Statements by the ministry

Social assistance	1145
Ms Akande	
Health insurance	1146
Ms Lankin	

Health insurance	1146
Mr Phillips	
Social assistance	1147
Mr Beer	
Health insurance	1147
Mr Harris	
Social assistance	1148
Mr Harris	

Oral questions

Budget	1148
Mr Conway	
Mr Laughren	
Job creation	1149
Mr Offer	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Harris	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Pilkey	
Budget	1151
Mr Conway	
Mr Laughren	
Social assistance	1152
Mr Jackson	
Ms Akande	
Education policy	1152
Mr Malkowski	
Mrs Boyd	
School transfer	1153
Mr Mancini	
Mrs Boyd	
Tax increases	1154
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Pilkey	
Workers' compensation	1154
Mr Ferguson	
Mr Mackenzie	
Tourism industry	1155
Mr H. O'Neil	
Mr North	
Mr J. Wilson	
Mr Laughren	

Petition

Ontario public service employee benefits	1156
Mr Runciman	

First reading	Visitors	1149
	The Speaker	
City of Niagara Falls Economic Protection Act, 1991,	Visitor	1155
Bill 94	The Speaker	
Mr Harris	Speaker's rulings	1156
Agreed to	Mr Jackson	
	Order of business	1156
Concurrence in supply	Mr Cousens	
	Mr Elston	
Ministry of the Environment	Mr Sterling	
Mr Cooke	Mr Harris	
Negated	Adjournment	1162
Other business	Lists of members	
Report of the conflict of interest commissioner	Members and their responsibilities	1163
The Speaker	Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1166
Anniversary of Polish Constitution		
Ms Ziemba		
Mr Ruprecht		
Mr Cousens		

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le jeudi 2 mai 1991

Affaires d'intérêt public émanant de simples députés	Déclaration d'un député	
Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur l'éducation (quotients électoraux), projet de loi 72	L'Hôpital Montfort	1141
M. Tilson	M. Morin	
Rejetée		
Loi de 1991 modifiant la Loi sur le ministère des Collèges et Universités, projet de loi 78	Première lecture	
M. Perruzza	Loi de 1991 pour la protection économique de Cité de Niagara Falls, projet de loi 94	1156
Adoptée	M. Harris	
	Adoptée	1156

CA2 3W
X
023

Document
Parlementaire



28 1991

28 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 6 May 1991



Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 6 mai 1991

Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Monday 6 May 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Mr Beer: Today I ask the Minister of Education to reverse her decision to withdraw Ontario from the national school achievement indicators program sponsored by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.

The goal of this project is to provide a Canadian information base that will enable provincial ministries of education to assess the performance of their education programs in comparison with Canada-wide standards. During hearings before the Ontario select committee on education from 1987 to 1990 many participants decried the lack of meaningful data on the performance standards of our education systems. This national program would help in establishing Canadian criteria, data and outcomes that would help us to improve our educational programs for all our students.

We all recognize that standardized tests alone are not a fair measure of any education system, but as part of a broader evaluation process they are a vital tool. Indeed, as the council's background document on this issue makes clear, there is growing agreement on the value of monitoring and evaluating educational systems at all levels. This has led to increased collaboration among the provinces in comparative studies of student achievement and the development of educational indicators.

I believe that the concerns as to how socioeconomic and cultural differences are reflected in the proposed school achievement indicators program can be addressed and overcome and that Ontario can and should participate. This project is one example where all the provinces, including Quebec, have agreed on a positive, far-reaching initiative. This is not the time for Ontario to opt out.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr Jackson: I call the attention of all members of the House to a resolution passed at the beginning of Police Week, yesterday, by the Municipal Police Authorities association to ask the Rae government to reinstate the name of the Queen back into the police oath of allegiance.

The Premier's arbitrary decision to remove the name of the Queen from that oath has been met by strong opposition from all sectors of Ontario society. I know that many members of our police services have been upset and angered by it as well.

Yesterday Ontario's police sent a clear message to the Premier that they wish to stand in defence of Canadian values and traditions, including the monarchy and explicit reference to the Queen of Canada in their oath.

On behalf of the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party, I would like to congratulate the association for its stand. I would also like to announce the start of a petition

campaign, to be conducted by our party, to collect as many signatures as possible from concerned citizens to have Her Majesty's name reinstated in the police oath.

I urge all who wish to sign the petition to contact a member of the Ontario PC caucus. This petition will give the citizens of Ontario an opportunity to tell the Premier that what he has done without public consultation is unacceptable to them and that he must undo the damage he has inflicted on our Canadian heritage. They will also be able to remind the Premier, who must take a responsible position at the constitutional table, about the great unifying role exercised by the crown as our foremost symbol and guarantor of Canadian national identity and parliamentary democracy.

WORKWEEK

Ms S. Murdock: On Tuesday night at 7:30, if members do not have a meeting, hopefully they will be watching TVOntario.

The average person spends the majority of his or her waking hours at work. It is our sole preoccupation for at least 40 hours per week for most of our lives. Yet up until now work and workers are often considered invisible, while sports or other leisure time activities absorb the attention of the media. Work, or at least most kinds of work, is often seen as the means to an end rather than something inherently interesting and creative in and of itself.

Last week I was honoured to speak at the official launch for WorkWeek, a TVOntario-CBC program that finally acknowledges something that we have known for a long time: Love it or hate it, work is one of the single most interesting and crucial experiences in life.

Congratulations to TVOntario and CBC Newsworld for recognizing the need for a program that looks at workplace issues and for taking the initiative to get it on the air. This program hits the waves at a time when the workplace is battered by layoffs and business closures. It is a challenge to the way that business is done. Labour, management and business must tackle problems differently.

I urge everyone in this House and at home to watch WorkWeek every Tuesday night at 7:30. It offers a weekly forum for in-depth discussions on work issues.

Congratulations and keep up the good work.

HAZARDOUS WASTE

Mrs Sullivan: On 18 April I asked the Minister of the Environment to step in with the money for the immediate cleanup of the X-Pert Metal Finishing site on Dillon Road in Burlington.

The site contains some 3,000 to 5,000 gallons of cyanide chemicals and an equal volume of acid. Together this is a lethal combination. Later that afternoon, the Ministry of the Environment issued a control order requiring the company and its directors to clean up toxic chemicals at the site. That order allowed for a 15-day appeal period.

Public concern is very high. This is evident from the contents of a petition from residents which I brought to the Legislature on 23 April. As well, the city of Burlington has passed a strong resolution requesting the minister to expedite the cleanup of the site.

The 15-day period allowed for appeal expired 3 May. The minister must act now. The chemicals are stored in an unsegregated fashion in deteriorated containers. The site is not fully fenced and part of it is accessible to children through an orchard. Houses are located as close as 50 feet to the site and the area close to the site is densely populated.

There is clear reason to expect that the owners, who have not met their previous obligations, will not meet their obligations to clean up the site now, with or without an order. The Minister of the Environment must step in, clean up the site and remove the toxic chemicals and the danger to the community. She has the authority. She must act now. The people in Burlington expect it.

1340

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr Arnott: Today I would like to talk about a subject which has received very little attention from the present government. It is the very serious matter of death, injury and destruction on our roads and highways.

In co-operation with police and the insurance industry, the Ministry of Transportation, on 30 April, announced a two-week campaign called Slow Down and Survive, essentially a province-wide crackdown on speeders and bad drivers. The Insurance Bureau of Canada has contributed \$100,000 to the promotion campaign and the Ministry of Transportation a paltry \$8,000, indicating this ministry's relative lack of commitment to this very serious matter of highway safety.

Statistics show that 4,221 people were killed and more than 284,000 were injured on our roads in 1989. Traffic accidents remain the number one cause of death for Canadians under 45. Coupled with this human tragedy are the economic costs which are incurred every time a personal injury accident occurs, ranging from acute hospital care to insurance claims and long-term disability.

This government must assume a stronger leadership role in addressing this crucial issue. Well-planned, co-ordinated initiatives must be undertaken by the ministry in partnership with broader private industry and interest group involvement to reduce fatalities and accidents on our roads.

Without question, the Ontario Provincial Police continue to perform their responsibilities for ensuring safety on our highways with competence and professionalism. This task is not theirs alone. Too often we seem to accept death on the highway as a fact of life. Steps must be taken to change this attitude. Change will not be achieved if this government persists in its gimmicky, Band-Aid approach to solving serious problems.

APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING

Mr Mammoliti: I rise today to pay tribute to the fine work being done by Local 27 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America in its apprenticeship and training program.

At its training centre, located at 64 Signet Drive in my riding of Yorkview, Local 27, in co-operation with the Toronto Construction Association and the Ministry of Skills Development, runs apprenticeship programs aimed at preparing the apprentice of today for the technological demands of the future.

Since the opening of the Patrick J. Campbell Training and Rehabilitation Centre in 1986, the apprenticeship program has advanced and enhanced the skills of nearly 900 young men and women. In addition, this truly remarkable educational facility has achieved a 97% placement rate for its students.

The building industry in Ontario will remain strong and vibrant only if we continue to educate and replenish the industry with a skilled and competent labour force. The carpenters of Local 27 have shown their desire to contribute to a better and stronger future by providing an apprenticeship facility second to none.

They, along with the Toronto Construction Association and the Ministry of Skills Development, should be proud of the fine work they are doing, as I am proud of wearing this United Brotherhood of Carpenters jacket. I realize that I am not allowed to wear the hat, but if I did I would tip my hat to the carpenters.

SEVERANCE PAYMENT AND TERMINATION HEARINGS

Mr Cleary: As all members of the Legislature are aware, Cornwall and the surrounding area have been hit hard by the recession. In fact, we are suffering an unfortunately high number of plant closures and layoffs.

Under such dire circumstances, it would only appear normal to expect support from this government. However, I believe the Ministry of Labour's procedures are aimed at hurting, not helping, the former employees of Courtaulds Fibres Canada (BCL).

After originally scheduling the severance payment and termination hearings for over 200 employees of BCL in Cornwall, it has come to my attention that the Ministry of Labour will be relocating these hearings to Ottawa.

The reason given, inadequate accommodation, is garbage. As these hearings are indeed still booked for local conference facilities, the minister knows full well that the riding of Cornwall can very well accommodate the needs of these hearings.

By relocating the hearings to Ottawa, the Ministry of Labour is sending a clear message that its hearings are neither accessible nor open. These hearings have been scheduled in Cornwall and must remain in Cornwall. The sheer distance and disturbance of travelling to Ottawa for four consecutive days is unnecessary, an additional burden for both the claimants and the company representatives of Courtaulds. I request the Minister of Labour to instruct the acting deputy minister, Jean Read, to revert back to the original plans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr Sterling: The members of our caucus, as representatives of many Ontarians, are angry. We are angry and frustrated by the atrocious budget which was introduced

by the New Democratic government one week ago today. The anger has not gone away as the days have passed into a week. In fact, it has become more intensified as we watch and listen to individual Ontarians react to this budget. If the NDP's members made themselves available to the general public over the weekend, I am sure that they would have got this message.

The members of our caucus believe that the government is using the routine procedures of this House, specifically the ministerial statements, to deflect the tension away from this outrageous budget, that it is making ministerial statements unnecessarily long and drawn out and that it is attempting to market its schemes as good news announcements in order to deter the attention of members of this House and the general public.

Therefore, I move that this House pass directly to oral questions immediately following the completion of members' statements today.

The Speaker: Any member is entitled to make a motion at just about any time. It requires unanimous consent. Do we have unanimous consent to move—

Some hon members: No.

The Speaker: No? Okay.

DEVELOPMENT DEPOSITS

Mr Perruzza: I am both alarmed and shocked about recent actions taken by North York city council in returning approximately \$25 million to developers in North York's downtown which rightfully belongs, according to city rules, to the taxpayers of the city of North York. Mayor Mel Lastman and North York council have set a double standard which favours developers while denying the taxpayers of the city of North York the opportunity to have their property taxes decreased by approximately 10%.

Developers, while receiving hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of zoning approvals, were required to promise to the city that they would begin constructing the projects within one year of approval. Developers vying for these lucrative zonings were required to post a deposit which would be forfeited if they reneged on their commitment to build. Their time expired and the developers did not keep their promise. Consequently, they should have forfeited their deposits to the city of North York. Instead, in a municipal election year, Mayor Mel Lastman and North York council in a quiet meeting decided to give developers a big break and returned approximately \$25 million worth of deposits.

Mayor Lastman and council are quick to forgive developers in tough economic times, but when home owners who cannot afford to pay high property taxes require relief and file poverty appeals with the city of North York, they are not as quick to forgive these taxpayers.

VISITOR

The Speaker: Before continuing, I would like to ask all members of the assembly to recognize in the Speaker's gallery today state senator of Nebraska and chairman of the Midwestern Legislative Conference, Senator Gerald Conway.

1350

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr Sterling: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I assume that you asked for unanimous consent of this House on my motion on the basis of standing order 44. Is that correct?

The Speaker: Yes.

Mr Sterling: I believe that is incorrect in that this motion was not a motion to either adjourn the House or adjourn the debate. It was a motion which was recognized in this House last week in terms of moving the procedures ahead.

I noticed in your judgement or your ruling last week, Mr Speaker, that you said that the motion to jump from one part of the proceedings to another part of the proceedings was a dilatory motion and you drew the analogy, as did Mr Edighoffer, our former Speaker, to these two motions for adjournment of the debate and adjournment of the House.

I want to say that I do not think it was contemplated, either by you, the Speaker, or the previous Speaker, that such a motion would ever be put in front of this House. Therefore, I think the strict analogy between the motion which I now propose and a motion to adjourn the House and a motion to adjourn the debate is wrong, and I say that for a number of reasons.

Mr Speaker, in your ruling of 2 May, on page 1158, you indicate that these types of motions are tactical, and that is true; they are tactical. The two previous motions, which were moved in both cases by either the government House leader or a government minister, were used as tactics by the government of the day to avoid tactics by the opposition, and they were ruled in order at that time. In both of those cases, the ruling by Speaker Edighoffer and yourself with regard to whether or not the tactical move was the same as an adjournment of the debate and an adjournment of the House, as considered specifically under rule 44, was really an overture or an extra ruling which was not required at that time. Therefore, I do not consider it binding on the Chair in terms of dealing with this particular motion.

Second, what is good for the goose is good for the gander as well. I would say that if the government has the right to introduce motions during routine proceedings to omit part of those routine proceedings, then surely it is within the ambit of the opposition to introduce a motion during the routine proceedings to omit part of the routine proceedings which it does not want to be involved in.

I think another very important point here is that rule 44(a), which is the one we are talking about today, is a rule which says that motions to adjourn the House or adjourn the debate cannot be put before question period. The meaning and the intention of that ruling, as far as I have always read it is concerned, and I think anyone reading it would think so, would be that the government, using its majority, cannot deny the opposition benches the right of questioning the government of the day in each legislative day.

Mr Speaker, my motion, which I have placed in front of you, does not deny the opposition its right to the question period. In fact, the way the motion is framed is such that it would encourage us to get along to question period and omit the ministerial statements, for the reasons I put in my particular statement.

The purpose of this rule is to protect the opposition in terms of dealing with this government and getting at it in terms of questions. I do not believe the ruling that a dilatory motion like this necessarily comes under rule 44(a) is necessary or right. I believe what you are doing, Mr Speaker, is taking away a right of the opposition when in fact previous Speakers have given that self-same right to the governments of the day, as was exhibited by the last government during the motions part of proceedings and by this present government during the introduction of bills.

Therefore, I would ask you to reflect upon this point of order, adjourn this House for 15 minutes and then come back and give us a ruling on it. I am sure you will find the motion in order.

Hon Mr Cooke: I am sure that the member for the Conservative Party will remember that when this matter was dealt with under Speaker Edighoffer, his party and my party in opposition made a couple of points with respect to moving to orders of the day. The number one point was that we wanted to avoid the opposition parties having their right to ask questions taken away by the government, as the member has pointed out.

Also, part of the standing orders of our rules very clearly allows the government ministers to make statements where the opposition parties have always said we should be making them, and that is in the House rather than out in the public without being held accountable in the Legislature. That is certainly a rule that we in this government want to continue to follow. Mr Speaker, if you are to accept the point being made by the acting House leader for the Conservative Party, it would also remove the right for the opposition parties to reply to policy statements by the government.

Clearly the ruling that was made by Speaker Edighoffer was made so that the motion to move to orders of the day could only be made at the point at which he suggested, which is clearly to protect the government's right to make announcements and the opposition's right to hold the government accountable, and I think that ruling is as applicable today as it was then.

The Speaker: To the member for Carleton, first with respect to the motion which he attempted to place earlier, I have already ruled on this matter. I do appreciate very much the member bringing this matter to my attention. It is a serious point. It is one which I will reflect upon, and I will be reporting back to you as soon as possible. My preference will be tomorrow, and I will come back with a ruling. I do appreciate the member bringing it to my attention.

SCHOOL TRANSFER

The Speaker: At the same time, at the close of last Thursday's question period the member for Burlington South rose on a point of order concerning an exchange between two members in that day's question period. The

member asked me to review Hansard, and I have since had an opportunity to review and reflect on the appropriate passages from Hansard. I am now in a position to report to the House.

Members will know that the Minister of Education indicated at page 1153 of Hansard that she was distressed that she was being "misrepresented in terms of my position and our government's position with respect to the school accommodation issue."

These remarks were made in response to a question from the member for Essex South, but they did not specifically allude to him or to any other member. Therefore, I do not find that the remarks of the minister transgress our standing orders.

I would be remiss if I did not indicate to all honourable members, and indeed remind them, that they should conduct themselves with dignity, decorum and respect, not only for the letter of our standing orders but for the spirit of those orders.

Mr Mancini: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If she was responding to a question from myself, whom do you think she was alluding to if she was not alluding directly to me?

The Speaker: To the member for Essex South, I reviewed the Hansard and there is no reference to any individual.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr Sterling: On this point of order, Mr Speaker: During members' statements I moved that this House pass directly to oral questions immediately upon the completion of members' statements today. You stood in your place and indicated you needed unanimous consent to that motion, and I had to assume or presume the grounds upon which you were making that particular request. I have asked you on a point of order why this particular motion is not in order. Your ruling from 2 May does not cover this kind of motion, and therefore that is why I suggested we adjourn for 15 minutes in order for you to be able to consider the matter, because your ruling today, while some might treat it as less important than I, is important for the opposition, to know whether it has the same rights as the government does in dealing with routine proceedings.

The Speaker: I have ruled on this matter and I have reported to you that I will deliberate on the point you have raised and will report back to the House. It is time for ministers' statements.

1400

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

OMA AGREEMENT

Hon Ms Lankin: I am delighted today to be able to provide some details to members regarding the ratification of the new agreement between the Ontario Medical Association and the government of Ontario.

This landmark agreement is the first in Ontario that reflects a determined effort to bring uncontrolled health costs into check. It was approved by the OMA council on the weekend.

Members may be aware of an internal OMA legal challenge to the ratification process. I have every confidence that the matter will be resolved soon. We will continue preparations to implement the agreement and will have everything in place when the OMA informs us it has acted on proper authority.

With the ratification of this agreement, Ontario's health care system is much healthier. Working together in a co-ordinated effort, we will foster efficiency and high quality where before there was misallocation and inattention. The heart of the system, fiscal management, will no longer have the overspending that had threatened medicare.

As the Treasurer said in the budget last week, to maintain a high quality of life in the midst of changing times we must establish new social partnerships to better manage our resources. Our new agreement with the Ontario Medical Association is an excellent example of the co-operative approach that will bring effective management.

This agreement brings to the system a new, co-operative approach to management that will allow for the kind of health care planning this province has always needed.

The very first page of the framework agreement sets out our common goals. For the first time in this province, physicians have committed themselves as a group to maintain the principles of medicare, with equal access to all our citizens.

Physicians have agreed to help the government achieve more value for health care spending in Ontario. They have agreed to help achieve the appropriate number, mix and distribution of physicians based on Ontario's needs.

A joint management committee, with representatives from the OMA and from government, will work to enhance the quality and effectiveness of medical care, including the pursuit of more value for existing spending.

The JMC will develop action plans to look at issues raised both by physicians and government. The plans will suggest areas of improvement and develop ways to implement those improvements. Those areas include such things as drug utilization, appropriate use of hospitals and waiting list registries. Each plan will suggest areas of improvement and consider effective ways to make those improvements.

It will constantly monitor our medical system, recommending new ways to improve care while making sure the people of Ontario are getting the most for their scarce tax dollars.

The committee will also provide a forum for physicians and government to work together, to end the animosity that has for too long characterized relations between the two parties. We both serve the people of this province. When we work together, that service will improve significantly.

Let me take a moment to put some figures in perspective. Total health care spending in Ontario this year will comprise about one third of our entire budget expenditure—\$17 billion. Fees for physicians alone last year accounted for about 10% of provincial expenditures—more than \$4 billion. Before this agreement, skyrocketing increases were beginning to shake the very foundations of medicare.

This collaborative effort with our physicians will result in immediate savings to the people of Ontario.

Over the last 10 years, payments to fee-for-service physicians have been increasing at an average annual rate of 12%. Even with a fee increase of under 2% in 1988-89 and zero fee increases in 1989-90 and 1990-91, physician payments in the two years without increases jumped nearly \$400 million. That is because there was no management system in place to control utilization, the growth of volume of services.

This year, per capita utilization is budgeted for a growth of 1.5%. If per capita utilization grows above that number, the government will be reimbursed for half of the excess from the total pool allotted for fee-for-service physicians.

The result is a system that provides a strong incentive for doctors to help in the process of bringing health care costs under control.

In 1977-78, OHIP payments accounted for 24% of Ontario's spending on health care. This year the health insurance portion will have mushroomed to about 32%. Not surprisingly, those increasing health insurance payments have come at the expense of other components of the health care sector and other government priorities.

This year, fee-for-service doctors will receive a total increase of 3.95%. In dollar terms for 1991-92, the increase for fee and utilization will cost about \$250 million. That is an increase of just under 7%, a full 5% below the recent historical average. That 5% represents a saving of \$180 million in just one year.

Because Ontario doctors have not had a fee increase since 1989, the agreement provides for a one-time payment in lieu of a fee increase of 2% for each of the last two years at a cost of about \$140 million. In addition, the government has agreed to provide malpractice insurance assistance for this year and the past two years at a cost of \$84 million. These one-time payments will not be incorporated in the base amount for determining future fee increases.

As well, individual doctors will face limits on gross fee-for-service billings. Physicians billing above \$400,000 will have excess fees discounted by one third. Amounts above \$450,000 will be discounted by two thirds. The threshold levels will be adjusted annually. The money saved by this measure will be used to pay for natural growth in the system, such as increases in population. These thresholds will encourage doctors to make high quality their priority, not high volume of high billings.

The economic portion of the agreement also features a new mechanism to settle disputes over monetary issues between the two sides. Dispute resolution will help us to achieve a fairness that this government considers a central principle.

The most important achievement is the creation of a system of management. For the first time since the introduction of medicare in 1971, there will be an annual budget for medical spending in this province. Government and the medical profession, in partnership, will stay within that budget. The days of open-ended medical spending are over. This government is establishing proper control over this essential social program.

We are moving away at last from the haphazard insurance system of the past to a planned system, a managed system.

The people of Ontario have clearly said that preservation of medicare is on the top of their priority list. That is one of the reasons they elected a social democratic government. They know our commitment to universal health care.

With this agreement we will not only preserve medicare; we will improve it. We have made sure that the people of Ontario will continue to have access to the highest-quality medical care at a cost they can afford.

ARTS AND CULTURE FUNDING

SUBVENTIONS POUR LES ARTS ET LA CULTURE

Hon Mr Marchese: In his budget announcement last week, my colleague the Treasurer recognized that culture is an important and growing industry.

En présentant son budget la semaine dernière, mon collègue le Trésorier a reconnu que la culture est une importante industrie croissante.

The Treasurer announced that \$7.5 million has been allocated in the provincial budget as an increase to the annual base funding of the Ontario Arts Council. When added to the annual inflation allowance, the OAC budgetary increase in 1991-92 is over 25%.

With the additional \$7.5 million in annual funding, the OAC will be able to create and provide strengthened links between education and the arts, more assistance to francophone and regional communities, more and larger individual grants to artists and organizations and secured operating grants to organizations for audience development.

In addition, we will see an arts council in this province that will truly reflect the multiracial, multicultural and multilingual makeup of Ontario.

1410

De plus, nous aurons dans cette province un conseil des arts qui reflète véritablement la composition multiraciale, multiculturelle et multilingue de l'Ontario.

When the Ontario Arts Council was established in 1963, there were fewer than two dozen publicly supported arts organizations in this province. Today, the council supports some 46 orchestras, 32 public art galleries, 3 visual arts schools, 6 first nations groups, 11 folk festivals, 46 theatre companies and 24 dance companies. That is in addition to over 1,600 individual artists who receive project funding. The OAC has a history of expanding to meet the needs of a flourishing Ontario cultural community and industry.

Today, the cultural sector employs over 75,000 people in Ontario: writers, choreographers, composers, visual artists, dancers, musicians, craftspersons, filmmakers, designers, actors, technicians, administrators and others. Representing nearly half of Canada's artistic activity and resources, the Ontario arts sector has very significant direct and indirect impacts on Ontario's economy. This boom reflects the wealth of talent, skill, ingenuity and creativity of the many rich and diverse cultural roots of this province.

Nous savons que la culture nous sert à trouver des emplois, à rester en contact les uns avec les autres, à ne pas oublier qui nous sommes et elle nous indique ce que nous pourrions devenir.

But this week's budget announcement moves our understanding a step beyond this critical role. As a government, we appreciate that the cultural sector is the fourth largest industry in Canada in terms of labour force. The economic impact of the arts and culture sector is about equivalent to that of mines and metals—larger than textiles, clothing and furniture. Yet almost a third of Canada's artists live below the poverty line. This is as likely to be true of accomplished, acclaimed performers, writers or visual artists with years of training and experience behind them as it is of a young person just starting out.

The vast majority of cultural workers are unprotected by unemployment insurance, health and safety benefits and the kind of routine protection we have fought to earn for other workers.

Les femmes, les autochtones et des minorités ethniques, raciales et linguistiques sont parmi les groupes de travailleurs culturels le plus souvent sous-employés, sous-représentés et les moins bien payés. Ce sont eux également qui le plus souvent subventionnent notre culture collective par leur travail bénévole.

Women, members of the first nations, and racial, linguistic and ethnic minorities are the most underemployed, underpaid and under-represented among our cultural workers. They are also the ones who most often subsidize our collective culture with their volunteer labour.

Many culturally diverse arts groups have limited access to public funds, and the arts sector itself is in serious financial trouble.

We need to ensure access to public funding for emerging groups and for those groups that have been shut out in the past. This means eliminating cultural or regional biases and supporting the growing number of artists and groups, particularly among first nations, francophone and other racial, linguistic and cultural communities.

I believe that the main challenge for this province and our country today is to create conditions in which we can live together in mutual respect. We need a society which protects what we want to be without destroying the right of others to be different and proud of it. This aspiration is not a new one, but it happens to be this generation that has acquired the need to make it possible.

A final point: Unlike other economic sectors, the arts cannot rely solely on market forces for revenue. Limited and falling private sector sponsorship, free trade, the recession and its effects on dwindling audiences and a decline in federal government funding have left many artists and artistic agencies in a financial crisis.

Canadian cultural products are systematically undercut by mass-produced imports: 76% of books sold in Canada are foreign; 97% of theatrical screen time is US-produced; 90% of TV drama is non-Canadian; and 85% of our music is produced outside of Canada.

In providing the Ontario Arts Council with the largest single increase to its funding in history, we are saying that

our culture is not expendable and not negotiable. It is not for sale.

C'est à nous de publier nos écrivains, de produire nos propres films, de mettre en scène notre danse et notre théâtre, d'exposer et de mettre en valeur nos artistes visuels. C'est à nous de soutenir les travailleurs et les industries qui créent et protègent notre riche culture unique et irremplaçable.

It is up to us to publish our writers, to produce our own films, to stage our own dance and theatre, to exhibit and appreciate our own visual artists. It is up to us to support the workers and the industries that create and protect our own unique and irreplaceable culture.

RESPONSES

OMA AGREEMENT

Mr Phillips: I am pleased to respond to the statement by the Minister of Health and to indicate that we are pleased that an agreement has been reached. We very much appreciate the role that the Ontario Medical Association plays in the life of this province and are pleased, as I say, that it seems to be pleased with the settlement. I would say, though, that as we look at the document—and I urge each member to review it because I received it, I guess, about 24 hours ago, or a little more than that—it is an extremely important document for the future of health care in the province, and I think it deserves a fair bit of study by all of us.

Certainly there are some issues in here that I would like at least to raise now, and as we have a chance to review the agreement over time, to feel confident that I can raise questions in the House around it.

First, I think we should appreciate that there is the establishment of a major new joint management committee with some very substantial responsibilities, with 50% from the government side and 50% from the OMA. The deputy minister will be on that committee. It will meet at least monthly and will have a large number of important agenda items. Decisions will be made by that committee on the basis of votes.

I guess my first concern is as we look at the public health issues that will move from the public domain into the private domain. This committee, as I say, will have a staff, will have a budget, will meet at least monthly, and will have a 50-50 representation. We have a brand-new model for dealing with some very important health issues here. On the one hand, all of us obviously very much support the co-operation between the government and the OMA. But one thing I think we must be careful of is that major policy public-health issues do not move from the public domain to the private domain. That would be one question that I will raise now and be perhaps asking further questions on.

The second thing is about the financial side. The minister mentioned that for this fiscal year there is some certainty. My understanding, though, reading the document, is that the determination of the size of the fund—of the pot, if you will—can be made by the arbitrator. So the certainty, in many respects, leaves the government at that stage and goes to an independent arbitrator. That may be fine, but that independent arbitrator is making a decision on the

basis of about a \$5-billion pot. That, the Treasurer will know, is more money than he receives from the federal government in transfer payments. So a very major step is being taken here as we let that decision move from the government to an independent arbitrator.

The third issue that I would raise and that we may have the chance to talk about over time is just how much flexibility we have lost with this agreement in terms of looking at new ways to solve our health issues in the future.

We are very pleased that an agreement has been reached. I would say to all members, though, that they will want to pore over this agreement because it fundamentally changes the way the health care system in this province works and will work in the future. It puts enormous responsibility in the hands of this joint committee. We will want, as I say, to further understand how that will unfold.

1420

ARTS AND CULTURE FUNDING

Mr Henderson: This announcement of a \$7.5-million funding hike to the Ontario Arts Council is a good step, but it is old, old stuff. This is not a minister's statement; it is a historical treatise. We should have asked for unanimous consent to even allow it.

Of course we welcomed the Treasurer's announcement a week ago of this funding increment. It is something that the Treasurer promised us details about; however, there are no details in this statement whatever. There are just platitudes and generalities and pillow talk.

Where are the promises that we heard about last summer? Why is the minister not telling us something about that? Why can he not be specific about what he is going to do? What about the new powers for artists on advisory boards and the imaginative new funding programs that we heard about? What about the upgrading of the arts in our school curricula, promoting of the arts in our factories and with our workers? What about the bold new funding measures for arts festivals we heard about, and what about the new tax breaks for artists and performers? What about the new programs for visiting performers and visiting artists and arts fairs? What about the expansion of the Royal Conservatory of Music and the promise of six years of free instrumental training for our children in Ontario? What about the new funding support for the Art Gallery of Ontario?

We would like to hear some real details of this funding increment. We welcome the \$7.5-million increment, and the arts council certainly does deserve it. We praise what is good in what we have heard, but we want to hear much, much more.

OMA AGREEMENT

Mrs Witmer: Our party is pleased at this time that the Ontario government and the Ontario Medical Association have reached an agreement in a spirit of co-operation. This spirit of co-operation is certainly an improvement over the hostile atmosphere that prevailed when the former Liberal government negotiated with the OMA. At that time, doctors in this province staged a strike.

Unfortunately, our party has just received a copy of the agreement. We have not had an opportunity to review the

agreement in detail and we are not certain as to what the total cost will be to our taxpayers. That is something that we are extremely concerned about.

We are also uncertain about the role of the joint management committee. It appears that some of the decision-making is going to be taken out of the hands of the public and become part of the private decision-making process. We certainly have some questions about that.

I think it is also important to remember that when we talk about health care costs, it is not the doctors who make up 100% of these costs. We must remember that if we are going to meet the needs of the citizens in this province, if we are going to provide the quality and effectiveness of health care to our citizens, we need to take a look at the hospitals that are running deficits, the hospitals that are closing departments, and the number of patients who are still being forced to cross the border for treatment and to go to other provinces.

We need to remember that in this last budget, there was absolutely no mention of community-based care or long-term care. I know that was very disappointing to seniors in this province and to those with disabilities who were looking forward to seeing some mention.

Therefore, although this agreement is a progressive step forward, I am still concerned, as are the members of our party, as to what the cost will be, and at what cost to the taxpayers in this province. I would ask the government to come forward at a later date with more of those details.

ARTS AND CULTURE FUNDING

Mrs Marland: In responding to the statement from the Minister of Culture and Communications, I guess what I have to say is that I do not know how many times we are supposed to jump up and congratulate this government on its reannouncements. This announcement was actually a one-line budgetary increase announced by the Treasurer last week, and here we are today up on our feet taking four pages to say what the Treasurer said in one line last week.

Frankly, I think the government has received its praise for its funding to the Ontario Arts Council. We have always supported the work of the Ontario Arts Council. We support the fact that the OAC in fact allocates the funds itself, that the money has always been given by the government to the Ontario Arts Council for its own disbursements.

However, I really have to wonder what it is that we are getting into with this new government. Are we going to get these sort of whoopee statements every day on stuff that it has already announced in the budget? Maybe it indicates that they do not have anything else to tell us. Maybe it is an indication that they are reaching so far that they have to go back and think: "Now, what is it we can announce today? Oh, yes. We'll reannounce something that we announced in the budget last week."

Quite frankly, I would have been more encouraged if this minister had made an announcement today dealing with the publishing industry support program. That is the statement and that is the announcement we are looking for. We already know from a federal government study that there are six Canadian publishing companies in the red. We would think that this government would be concerned

about that. We would think that we would have more than just a sketchy outline of what that program is going to be, and we look forward to this minister telling us something in a ministerial statement that we do not already know.

ORAL QUESTIONS

ASSISTANCE TO BUSINESS

Mr Kwinter: I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology. Last week, the minister announced a \$57-million manufacturing recovery program which is intended to provide loans and loan guarantees and possible financial assistance to hire management personnel and technical and marketing personnel. This is really to help small businesses and small manufacturers who are having difficulties. At the same time, the minister announced that he would add an additional \$11 million to the Innovation Ontario budget, actually doubling it.

My question to the minister is: Since in 1991 the budget for MITT is exactly the same as it was for 1990, and since he has announced these new programs, could he please tell me where he is going to get the the new additional funding to provide these programs?

Hon Mr Pilkey: There was a rearrangement of priorities within the ministry, and while it is true that the operating budget of MITT is identical to that of the previous year, when including the capital portion of the budget with the operating, the budget is in fact up 11%.

Mr Kwinter: One of the amazing transformations that happened to the Premier on his way to the Premier's office is that he admitted he had learned to add. Prior to that—

Hon Mr Rae: I've never made that admission.

Mr Kwinter: No, the Premier did. He said, on British Gas, "I can add." On 17 March, when the Premier stood up and said that he would never allow it, he obviously admitted he could not add. Notwithstanding that, the point is that on all the programs they had promised, they now say: "Well, we didn't realize the numbers. We couldn't add."

I am hoping we can have more luck with the minister. He has just announced that he is going to increase his budget by 11%. Is that correct? I take it that it is. If he could just add and if he could calculate, he has announced \$57 million for the manufacturing program, the recovery program. He has announced \$11 million for the Innovation Ontario program. There is a flat line on the budget which represents a 5% decline. In total, the amount of money that is being utilized for this program is 40% of the MITT budget.

The Speaker: Could we have a question.

Mr Kwinter: Even giving him the benefit of the doubt on the 11%, where is the rest of that money going to come from?

Hon Mr Pilkey: The information I conveyed to the member for Wilson Heights is correct. I did indicate to him that his calculations, in so far as they went in comparing this year's operating costs to last year's, were in fact identical, and there was an 11% increase when one combines the capital expenditures.

There was, within the budget, a realignment of priorities, which I think is typical of all budgets from year to year. As well, the financing for many of the programs is on a multi-year basis because the takeup will be over a successive number of years. That perhaps is an explanation as to why the member cannot quite come to terms with the exact figures: there is a takeup, it is on a phased basis, the program is multi-year and it will be financed on a multi-year basis.

1430

Mr Kwinter: I just want to quote—this is an added little benefit that I received, because I did not expect the minister to say that. In effect, if I can only find it in here, there is a specific provision that all of these funds must be taken up. Here it is. Sorry; I just found it. It says: “Interested companies are encouraged to contact my ministry’s small business hotline. All applications must be made prior to the end of the current fiscal year.”

The point I am trying to make is that notwithstanding the minister’s 11%, even though he had his 11%, there is a 30% discrepancy. There is 30% that he has not accounted for. We have all of the programs he has announced; they are already at the ministry. There is nothing new at all. The point is that the minister is playing games, and I would like to know what programs he is going to discontinue when we have all of these serious problems affecting Canadian industry. What 30% of his budget is going to disappear? Could he answer that question, please.

Hon Mr Pilkey: There is no attempt to play any games with respect to the budget. These new programs actually are new initiatives that were fed into the budget process. That is not to deny, that is to admit as well, that there were certain restrictions placed on the normal operating budget of not only our ministry but in fact of all ministries.

The question as to why the member cannot seem to add all the numbers up and make them come out to where he thinks they should is simply because the applications are closed off, but the takeup and the development of the program may span one, two or three years. Management Board sets the method of financing of when these allocations will come forward. That is why the budgeted amounts are spread over that particular time and not shown in the very same year in which it was allocated and announced.

HUNTING AND FISHING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr Scott: My question is not for the Solicitor General, who I see still proposes to cling to the wreckage of his portfolio for a day or two longer; it is rather a question for the Minister of Natural Resources.

The minister will know that under the leniency guidelines which have been in effect under the previous two governments and, I believe, in a slightly modified form in this one, it has been the practice to lay charges under the Game and Fish Act in cases where the take is beyond the needs of personal consumption and then to apply the leniency guidelines following that, so that the public knows that a charge has been laid; then it is withdrawn and the public knows an act of leniency has taken place. This prac-

tice has been followed by both preceding governments and I believe by this one. The minister will be aware of a large investigation at Cape Croker in which there was evidence that some six tons of fish were taken. We have been told, and there has been, I gather, a leak to the *Toronto Star* from some loyal servant of the minister’s, that the deputy minister intervened to stop this process before the charges were even laid, rather than using the leniency principle.

I want to ask the minister, does he condone this type of interference in the laying of charges by the deputy minister? How often has the deputy minister acted as a judge on these issues before charges have been laid? Was the minister involved himself in the decision-making process which short-circuited this investigation?

Hon Mr Wildman: The member will know, since he has referred to the leniency guidelines that have been in effect since 1979, the process, is that in cases where commercialization is suspected and/or special investigations are deemed necessary, prior to the instigation of such an investigation the deputy minister and senior staff review the need for such an investigation before authorizing it. Then, after the investigation is complete and evidence is collected, the investigating officer refers that evidence to the deputy minister and the senior staff for review to determine whether or not evidence indicates charges should be laid.

I do not have any personal involvement in or knowledge of the particular case that the member refers to, and I want to assure him that the decision was made by the deputy minister and his senior staff in whom I have the fullest of confidence.

Mr Scott: The reality is, apart altogether from a pre-investigation situation—which this is not, because the investigation was largely completed at a cost of \$140,000—the practice is to lay the charge and then to apply the leniency guidelines so that the public will know, for better or for worse, exactly what is happening.

The Sparrow case says that personal consumption is the test. The minister accepts that. That has always been the leniency guideline. In this case what was proposed to be consumed was six tons of fish. It clearly cannot meet the personal consumption test.

I want to ask the minister—I presume he will accept responsibility for his department and for his agents, even if the Solicitor General continues not to—what he is going to do to interview the deputy minister to determine the circumstances that happened. We have six tons of fish going bad. We have an investigation that took \$140,000. We have the decision made not to lay charges, in which the minister played no part. What I want to ask is, has he changed his policy? If not, is he going to apply the—

The Speaker: Would the member take his seat, please.

Hon Mr Wildman: The member is fully aware that the policy, in terms of how the policy is applied, has not changed. It is the similar policy that has been in effect since 1979. The member will also be aware that the decision with regard to the laying of charges has been subject

to review by the deputy minister and his senior staff, as has been the case in the past.

He also will be aware that since the Sparrow decision the government has instituted consultations with aboriginal organizations and with many groups, such as the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the World Wildlife Fund Canada and others, about a new enforcement regime that will be an interim regime while we negotiate the agreements that will ensure that the aboriginal right recognized by the Sparrow decision is able to be exercised while conservation and public safety are protected. That is the situation we are in. That is the situation as it has been stated in the House. Nothing has changed.

Mr Scott: The minister surely cannot pretend that nothing has changed. The guidelines and the Sparrow case say that charges will be laid unless the fish or moose or whatever is taken is sufficient only for personal consumption. What we are talking about here is six tons of fish. It would take a lot of Fridays to eat six tons of fish, even for a Catholic like me.

What I want to say to my honourable friend is, when will he face up to it? Have the guidelines been changed, or has the deputy taken a step that is not consistent with the guidelines? While we are at it, as a supplementary, having aborted this investigation, the OPP have now, I understand, been called in to pull out all stops to find out who leaked this information to the Toronto Star about the whole affair. What I want to know is, what happened after all to this government, which was going to allow whistle-blowers full freedom, even in the Ministry of Natural Resources?

Hon Mr Wildman: Is this multiple choice after the five questions that were asked? I think it is not appropriate for a member of this House to stand here and attack the integrity of a public servant such as the deputy minister. I would say that since the Sparrow decision it is incumbent upon all legislators, not only in Ontario but across Canada, to reflect on the aboriginal right to consume fish and game for food and for community use or ceremonial purposes, and on the responsibility of the government to protect conservation and public safety. It is most unfortunate to attempt to make political games out of such a sensitive issue.

1440

TAXATION

Mr Stockwell: To the Premier: The response from his gas guzzler tax has been very clear and it has come from all angles, all walks of life, including union presidents. I quote from Ron Davis, Local 199 president, saying that, "I'm in favour of reducing emissions, but I don't know if that is really the way to attack the problem." The chairman of Ford, Ken Harrigan, has said, "It will unquestionably cause job layoffs in St Thomas and Windsor," the gas guzzler tax that the government has put forward.

Considering the fact that the response from both management and union has been the same, what does he suggest he tell these auto workers, or we tell these auto workers when we come across them, that his government has just changed the word from "green" to "greed," and that they lose their job because of it?

Hon Mr Rae: I am going to let the Treasurer answer that question.

Hon Mr Laughren: I should say to the member for Etobicoke West that I certainly understand that people who are involved in jobs in which either the engines for these vehicles are produced or the vehicles themselves are being assembled are concerned about the gas-guzzler tax.

I would simply remind the member that I think only about 15% of the vehicles that are covered under the gas guzzler tax are sold in this province and the rest are exported, so I think that to put it in perspective the member should understand that it is not as though every one of these vehicles or engines is sold in the province of Ontario and will be affected by the new tax in the province.

Mr Stockwell: The Chevy Lumina and the Buick Regal are in fact manufactured in Oshawa. These are directly impacted by the Treasurer's gas guzzler tax. These are going to affect jobs in this province. They are affecting jobs in Oshawa and in GM plants around this province.

The Ford Motor Co chairman, Ken Harrigan, has said that without question this gas guzzler tax is going to cost jobs for Ontario auto workers in St Thomas and Windsor. Windsor, a town ravaged by this recession, needs more job layoffs like it needs a hole in the head.

The response has been very clear. The Treasurer changing the name of this gas guzzler tax in the name of the environment is just simply changing the word "green" to "greed." It is simple greed and a tax ripoff that is costing people their jobs and new taxes.

The question to the Treasurer is, what does he say to those auto workers who are now going to be unemployed, who are going to lose their jobs because he cannot accept the fact that this tax is going to cost the Ontario economy dollars and jobs? What does he say to these auto workers?

Hon Mr Laughren: To be fair, the member should at least acknowledge the fact that all the models of the cars that are categorized as, for example, the Chev Lumina, are not covered by the gas guzzler tax. It is only certain models with the larger engines and less fuel economy.

Mr Stockwell: Yes, the big-selling models.

Hon Mr Laughren: No, that is not true. I understand the problem. I have received no indication of specific potential job losses from the industry and, as well, the member is completely wrong if he says that it should be called a greed tax, not a green tax.

There were three reasons for the gas guzzler tax to be increased. One was for protection of the environment, two was for energy conservation, and I would be less than candid if I did not say that it increases revenues for the province of Ontario as well.

Mr Stockwell: The Treasurer is the only person who has not heard from the auto industry, if he is suggesting that. Everyone, I believe, in this House has heard from the auto industry and everybody from the auto industry is saying that this is a bad tax.

I will take the Treasurer back to 1988; this debate was taking place in the House. Let me alert the members to what the Treasurer, the then critic in the NDP caucus, said regarding the Liberals' increases in the tax for the gas

guzzlers: "simply another tax grab by the Liberals." In 1988 the Treasurer called these taxes tax grabs by the Liberals. Today he is calling them responsible environmental laws passed by his government.

All power companies have called it a bad news budget. All union locals have called it a bad news budget. The only person who supports this is the president, Bob White, and he does not speak for the union representatives who are being laid off in the car towns.

Interjections.

The Speaker: You will get your question, but I would appreciate the opportunity to hear the question.

Mr Stockwell: The question to the Treasurer is three-fold. He is saying it is an environmental act; back in 1988 he called it a tax grab. It is more revenue; there is no question about that. He is suggesting he is not hearing from the auto workers and the chairmen of certain boards, from GM to Ford.

The Speaker: And the question?

Mr Stockwell: Why does the Treasurer not give them the opportunity of giving him input? Why does he not go to the car towns and have public hearings and hear from the workers, hear from the people who are affected most by this? If the government is open and accessible, it will agree to it. If it is not, it will not agree to it. I would like to hear the Treasurer's comments to that.

Hon Mr Laughren: First of all, to correct what the member said, I did not say I had never heard from the industry at all. I know there was a lot of noise when I was responding, but what I said was, I had not received any information on specific job losses concerning the gas guzzler tax.

As far as my comments in 1988 are concerned, I think fairminded observers would agree that in 1988, when the economy was booming, there were a lot more alternatives and options for raising revenues than there are today, and I think the public out there expects us to pass laws and to pass taxes that will both conserve energy and enhance the environment.

BUDGET

Mr Harris: My question is of the Premier. I would like to remind the Premier of his words on 20 November in the throne speech. At that time he said, "This is a government that will listen to the people and respond to their needs to the best of its ability."

I have heard from the people. Their response on his budgetary policy is loud and clear—they believe he is proceeding 180 degrees in the wrong direction. They are angry, they are not going to take it any more. Why is the Premier so opposed to my call to hold full public hearings on this budget before proceeding further?

Hon Mr Rae: I do not pretend that I have any pipeline to the people, any more than the leader of the third party does. I can only tell him that perhaps he and I have been talking to different people.

My sense is that the people of the province understand that we are in a recession. They understand that this is precisely the time when governments need to reach out

and do something for people. That is precisely what we are trying to do as a government, and I would say to the honourable member that if they have to choose between the policies that we are advocating and the policies that are being advocated by his federal cousins which have contributed so directly to the mess that we now find ourselves in, I still believe the people would prefer the option which we are presenting to them in this budget. I really believe that.

That notwithstanding, let me say to the honourable member—

The Speaker: Quickly, please.

Hon Mr Rae: —that in the normal course of events in this House, the budget bills will go out to committee. They will be discussed in committee. If the member wants to have a discussion about any aspect of our budgetary policy with respect to what we are doing, it is there. There is a budget debate in the House, which is a full opportunity for people to discuss; the estimates process, which will begin very soon. I think people would rather do that than to see somebody ring bells and—

The Speaker: Premier, take your seat, please.

1450

Mr Harris: The Premier will know that if we follow that policy, it will all culminate about five days before Christmas, after the budget has already been implemented, after he has collected the taxes for six or seven months, after he has started down this path to destroy the economy of this province.

Here is what the Premier said, and I will read it to him one more time.

Interjections.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party, just a moment. The leader, like all members, has a right to be heard uninterrupted. We are back, as we so frequently find ourselves, in a scenario where we hear questions we do not like and we hear responses we do not like. It is a difficult aspect of parliamentary life, I realize. Perhaps we could allow the leader of the third party to place his question.

Mr Harris: The Premier said on 20 November, "This is a government that will listen to the people to the best of its ability." That is what he said.

Seventy five per cent of the eligible voters in this province did not vote for his government. He does not have a mandate to destroy this province's economy. He has pursued a disastrous course that is clearly 180 degrees in a different direction from what the people felt he stood for, listening to all his comments through the campaign and before. Why is he so opposed to letting the public come before a legislative committee and tell him what they think of this budgetary direction? Why is he opposed to hearing from the public before he starts down this track that they are so opposed to?

Hon Mr Rae: If the budget bills are referred out, we are delighted to have a discussion with respect to what is going on.

I just got a copy of the press release put out by the PC party, in which the leader of the third party alleges, "The

New Democrats tried to silence us last week." The only people who tried to silence anybody were the people who were ringing bells. They silenced themselves. We are ready to debate the budget any time he wants to debate the budget, anywhere, any place. He should name the place. Why not do it right here?

Mr Harris: The Premier wants the debate to proceed without hearing from the public. We know where he stands on the budget; he drafted the stupid thing. People know where I stand on the budget; I am not going to let it pass. I think they know where we stand on the budget.

What I am asking the Premier for is what he called for in opposition, what he has always said, what he said right in his throne speech: "To the best of our ability, we will listen to the people." Before he starts debating, before he asks people on all sides of the House to make up their minds, I am asking him to listen to the people. Why then will he not allow the whole budget to go out to a legislative committee so we can hear from the people before we hear the debate?

Hon Mr Rae: The leader of the third party, in a rather novel constitutional argument, says that he has no intention of letting the budget pass. I can only say to the member that we are—

Interjection.

Hon Mr Rae: The Liberals are the ones who called the election after three years; he wants to have one after seven months.

Under the constitutional rules of the House, it seems to me that the leader of the third party is certainly entitled to express himself in any way he chooses, but I can only say to him that we have brought in a budget which reflects the situation that we are in, which is a very serious recession. We have charted a path with respect to the future that we are prepared to debate in this House at any time. We are more than happy to have the bills referred out to committee and have them fully discussed in committee. In the normal course of events, we will have an estimates process. Why would the leader of the Conservative Party deny the New Democratic Party what every other government in the history of the province has been able to do?

OMA AGREEMENT

Mr Phillips: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. It has to do, of course, with the agreement that she announced today between the Ontario Medical Association and the government. The agreement contains the establishment of quite a senior level joint management committee that will be operating with the deputy and a senior person of OMA and equal representation on each side.

It is certain in reading the document that this committee is going to have a very large input into the health care system in the province in the future. The mechanisms that are set up, as the minister knows, call for a structure in voting that requires both sides to agree on matters before action can be taken. How does the minister respond to people who say that the structure of this committee does hand over, some say excessive, but certainly a very large

amount of power and responsibility in the determination of public health policy to a non-elected group, albeit of high-calibre people, that is operating really behind closed doors in a manner that will take an awful lot of the public policy issues and see them decided, in a sense, in a bargaining environment between two parties?

Hon Ms Lankin: This is a very new and, we believe, innovative relationship that we are establishing in this province between the medical profession and the government, moving towards a joint management of the health care system but not unilaterally just the government and the medical profession. We believe that there needs to be involvement of other health care professionals and there needs to be involvement and dialogue with the consumers as well.

The composition of the joint management committee will allow for us on the government side to involve others in that process, and we fully intend to make use of that opportunity. Additionally, with respect to the issues that the joint management committee will be dealing with and developing its action plans on, those are issues that can be brought forward by the physicians and by the government. It is our hope that together, collaboratively in a partnership, we will actually develop better-working plans. But in areas where there is not a clear answer or where there is not a clear implementation plan, the government will have to continue to manage and will have to continue to develop health care policy in the broadest sense of consultation with consumers and other health care providers.

Mr Phillips: The minister partially answered it, but one of the lines in the document that caught my attention says, "The Ontario Medical Association has assumed important public responsibility in the joint management of all medical services and all issues related to the health care system of Ontario." "Joint" was, I thought, an important word there, and "all medical services and all issues related to the health care system." As I said in my remarks earlier, I am pleased that agreement has been reached, but that is quite a broad statement that, at least for other people in the health care professions, raises questions of whether there is a two-tiered involvement: the doctors and then all others.

The minister, in her response to my first question, suggested that she is prepared to consider involvement by other professions. I wonder if she is prepared to consider that in some formal mechanism. I realize she said they could be part of the government side, I gather, of the joint management committee, but is she prepared to look at similar models for other professions that might have a similar input into the health care issues in the province?

1500

Hon Ms Lankin: There are many models already of joint bodies and bodies that involve consumers and other health care professionals that will be looking at issues around scope of practice, issues around policy with their professions.

With respect to this particular joint management committee, as we indicate in the agreement, there will be issues of joint concern, brought forward either by physicians or by the government, that will be dealt with. Let me give an

example of some of those issues so that it might be clear, although we do not intend at all to exclude the input of other health care professionals, why we want to start off with this joint committee and this joint structure under this agreement.

For example, the system of management that we are putting in place is one that relies on our being able to have a utilization formula that will actually keep us within a limit, within a budget, within a pool of money set aside for doctors' billings. That utilization formula, in order for it not just to be arbitrary and unilateral, will require the co-operation of both parties to work on things like the growth in number of physicians and where physicians practice. We have a problem in this province with respect to rural medicine.

Action plans around those sorts of issues will be addressed by this joint management committee, and I think I would say as an old negotiator that when you look at a negotiated deal from a negotiator's point of view you usually look for a win-win situation. I think here in this one we have a win-win-win situation.

The Speaker: Would you conclude your remarks, please.

Hon Ms Lankin: Just wrapping up then, we have the government of Ontario that I think wins in fiscal responsibility and better quality health care; doctors who care about the delivery of quality service and not just a revolving-door medicine will win; and the public, through both other health care professional involvement and consumer involvement, will win from both of these items.

NON-PROFIT HOUSING

Mr Tilson: My question is for the Minister of Housing. The minister will be aware of my estimate released this morning during a press conference of the potential of about \$170 million in fees charged by consultants, architects, brokers and lawyers for work on this government's non-profit housing incentives if proper cost controls and accountability are not introduced.

I wonder if the minister would tell the House exactly what steps he is prepared to take to ensure that the current rate of spending on such fees and charges is brought under control and that persons providing services for these programs are paid only for the work they actually perform. Would he not agree that the Treasurer's budget promise of refining programs, speeding up approvals and reallocating units suggests only that haste might make for even further waste?

Hon Mr Cooke: First of all, I do not accept the argument that the Conservative Housing critic has made. We follow in our government, as the previous government did and as the government previous to it did and the federal government does now under the federal-provincial program, the same types of guidelines, and originally the guidelines were set by the federal government.

I understand where the Housing critic for the Conservative Party is coming from. He is coming from the point of view that the government should not be involved at all in the creation of housing in this province. Our party fundamentally disagrees with that point of view.

At a time when the economy is very poor, we decided that we were going to create the 35,000 units that are in the system now plus 10,000 more of those units. That will provide affordable housing for the people of this province and thousands of jobs for people in the building industry. That is something I am very proud of, and I am not at all defensive or going to attack that type of program as the member seems to be willing to.

Mr Tilson: Our party certainly supports non-profit housing; it is a must. However, this government clearly has no intention of saving. Surely they would be interested in saving 1% of \$2 billion. All we are asking for is some controls on the proposals that they are putting forward.

Given the fact that by my calculation there are just over 22,000 Homes Now units which are neither built nor as yet under construction, would the minister confirm the fact that there are just over 22,000 Homes Now units that are not built yet? Would the minister agree with me that if that is the case, it is not too late to introduce proper cost controls that would apply to these units as well as to the 10,000 units that were referred to by the Treasurer in his budget last week?

Hon Mr Cooke: I should point out to the critic that the number that he used in the press conference today and that he has reiterated in the House, the \$170 million, sure is a lot of money, but it represents about 2.4% of the cost of the program. Combined with the program that the previous government initiated, we are spending about \$4 billion in housing for the people of this province, so the cost is about 2.4% of the total cost.

The critic for the Conservative Party will know that we are going to be releasing soon a consultation document on supply. If the critic for the Conservative Party has any suggestions of how cost can be further refined, I am more than willing to listen to those suggestions from the critic. But this morning when he was asked that question by the press, he could not answer it.

HUNTING AND FISHING IN ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr Drainville: I would like to address a question to the minister responsible for native affairs. As he knows, there have been a number of articles recently regarding aboriginal hunting and fishing rights, especially as regards enforcement procedures. Would the minister please inform this House of the policy of the Ministry of Natural Resources expressly regarding the enforcement process.

Hon Mr Wildman: This is an important issue, and I thank the member for Victoria-Haliburton for raising it again. The member will know, as has been indicated in this House previously, that the policy is to minimize instances of charges against aboriginal people when fishing or hunting for food for community use under the Game and Fish Act, the Fisheries Act or the Migratory Birds Convention Act.

The member will also know, as I indicated in a previous answer, that in cases where commercialization is suspected or special investigations are needed, a policy similar to the one instituted in 1979 has been continued. However, it is important to recognize that in 1986 under the previous government, the policy was changed to

ensure that the deputy minister and senior staff intervened both at the beginning of the investigation and prior to the laying of charges.

Mr Drainville: The honourable minister has indicated the process, but more particularly there is no question that in some of these articles there have been allegations that the ministry and/or the minister have allowed unrestricted—I underline unrestricted—hunting and fishing in Algonquin Park. I wonder if the minister could comment on that. What is the present situation in Algonquin Park and what is the situation around hunting and fishing specifically?

Hon Mr Wildman: As has been indicated again previously in the House, the situation in Algonquin Park is somewhat unique because of the land claim. But in regard to the question of unrestricted hunting and fishing, that of course is completely unfounded.

The ministry is currently involved in negotiations with the Algonquins of Golden Lake for subagreements on enforcement in relation to moose hunting, deer hunting and fishing in their land claim area. These negotiations and subagreements deal with levels of harvest, seasons, methods, enforcement mechanisms, conservation, public safety, parks' values.

The moose agreement, for instance, sets forward hunting from late fall to mid-January. Areas will be excluded where tourists are frequenting the park, and there will be rules regarding the use of motorized vehicles and vessels in the park. This is not unrestricted hunting or fishing.

TAXATION

Mr Conway: I have a question to the Treasurer and it concerns his budget. If the Treasurer looks at page 7 of his budget, he will see there, as he knows well, that in this document he raised the gasoline tax by approximately 25%, he says on the ground of environmental concern.

Accepting the legitimacy of a concern around the environment, what does he say to the thousands of people who live in rural communities like Renfrew county, North Adlington, North Hastings, Haliburton, those tens of thousands of Ontarians living in the rural parts of the province who on a daily basis must drive, must depend upon their half-ton truck and their automobile for their work and for their family life? What does he say to those people who will be burdened with this 25% increase in something as essential to their livelihoods and their jobs as fuel in communities where there is absolutely no alternative?

1510

Hon Mr Laughren: I think that we live in an era, other than in major metropolitan centres where there is easy access to public transit, where virtually everybody in the province requires some kind of transportation requiring the consumption of fuel. I understand that. As a member from northern Ontario representing a riding that is very large, I appreciate the sentiments of some people about the tax increase as well. I was in my constituency on the weekend and heard the views of my own constituents in this regard.

I would simply say to those people about whom the member is concerned that it is one of those taxes that we feel will accomplish a couple of things. I have said this before. It will make a contribution, we think, to energy conservation. We think as well, and I would not pretend otherwise, that it contributes to the coffers of the province to help us deliver important social programs which those same people who pay the taxes require, whether it is education or health care or whatever.

The Speaker: Would the minister conclude his remarks, please.

Hon Mr Laughren: I would also just remind the member about the tax increases in gasoline that while 1.7 and 1.7 are a substantial increase, it was not as high as the tax increase imposed by the government in Quebec.

Mr Conway: On page 8 of the budget, I know my constituents would be very impressed to see that there was some relief—I think appropriate relief—under the guise of the Let's Move initiative to further support the good works of the Toronto Transit Commission. But I repeat, in communities like Denbigh and Killaloe and Shining Tree, there is no TTC. There is absolutely no alternative to the half-ton truck and the automobile for livelihood and for family life.

Two-part supplementary: Will the Treasurer contemplate some relief to people living in rural communities all across Ontario in light of this situation where they have no alternative and where this 25% increase in an essential service like fuel is going to be very burdensome? Would he comment that perhaps he has changed his opinion in this Legislature since that day in December 1988 when, speaking to a gasoline tax increase brought about by a previous government, he said, "Any politician who would seriously argue that there was an environmental ingredient in a gasoline tax hike was misleading the Legislature with hogwash"?

Hon Mr Laughren: I am going to have to check the record because I find it hard to believe I said that.

However, I would say to the member in a serious way that if I had considered relief to people in border communities, to people in northern Ontario, to people in rural communities, to people in eastern Ontario, it would have eroded the whole tax base of the fuel tax system to a degree that was unacceptable to me. I think before we pass judgement simply in opposition to taxes we should think very seriously about the services that those taxes help us deliver.

Mr Cousens: In the absence of the Minister of the Environment, I have a question for the Premier. He had not indicated that he was leaving. We sent a note across indicating the question. Is the Premier coming back or has he gone?

Hon Mr Laughren: He is long gone.

Mr Cousens: Is he not coming back to answer the question? I know the anger that he used to show when someone would leave. I will not show that anger. I will try the acting Deputy Premier who will now become the environment person for the province.

Interjection.

Mr Cousens: It is not impossible.

Mr Scott: Why carry on question period if the person you want to ask is not here?

Mr Cousens: That is what bothers me. We come here to try to get some answers in question period—

The Speaker: Could we now have the question?

Mr Cousens: —and it is just impossible. We just start to talk—I do not know what—

The Speaker: The member for Markham, if he would like to place a question, may do so to the Deputy Premier.

Mr Cousens: I will ask the Treasurer and Minister of Economics. In last week's budget, he indicated that the government is going to increase fuel taxes for cars and trucks and tractors, planes and trains. He has also added a gas guzzler tax that hits small cars, cars that you would normally buy to be very economical. He even has the Prelude in there. He has added the gas tax and he has added the gas guzzler tax, which is a huge increase in taxes, all in the name of conservation and a better environment. Could the Treasurer tell this House what percentage of these revenues that he is raising in the name of the environment will go into the Ministry of the Environment?

Hon Mr Laughren: I think the member understands that we do not in this province have a system of designated taxes, although I hasten to add that I do think that is something that we should take a serious look at.

Mrs Cunningham: That is what you used to say over here.

Hon Mr Laughren: I did say that. That is correct. I said that we should—

Mrs Cunningham: A little bit consistent here for a change.

Hon Mr Laughren: I will talk to you, Mr Speaker.

The Speaker: That is the way it works.

Hon Mr Laughren: It is something that we should seriously consider, although I do not want to make a commitment. I have always felt that governments impose taxes, collect the taxes and disburse the tax revenues and then live or die by the priorities they establish in the way in which they allocate those revenues. I think that there are a couple of areas where we should at least consider the allocation of taxes, but I hasten to add that absolutely no decision has been made in that regard at this point.

Mr Cousens: What a change. I cannot believe this person standing up, from what he was before to what he is now. Now he is going to think about it. I do not know what he is going to do. The fact of the matter is they are raising a heap of money in the name of the environment and I want to know, and this side of the House wants to know, and so do the people out there want to know, how much money is going to go into the environmental pot. He has collected about \$150 million or more on the tire tax and it just sits there not being used to help any of the initiatives going on. He has announced \$28 million toward the 3Rs. We know there is that little bit happening, but as for really putting money into a comprehensive, organized plan of the

Ministry of the Environment so that we can begin to deal with environmental issues, that is what we want to know. How much money is he going to allocate towards the Ministry of the Environment that comes out of all the money he is collecting in the name of the environment?

Hon Mr Laughren: I might say two things in response to the member: First is that the estimates from the various ministries will be tabled tomorrow and there will be a breakdown and the member will get an answer, but, second, and I think more important, when a province has a Minister of the Environment who is as dedicated to the protection of the environment as this Minister of the Environment is, I am not sure you need to designate the taxes to any particular ministry.

COST OF ELECTRICAL POWER

Mrs Mathysen: My question is not to the Solicitor General who continues to inspire the confidence of Ontarians by virtue of his conscientious hard work—

The Speaker: The question is for?

Mrs Mathysen: —nor is it to the Minister of Natural Resources who has shown intelligent and sensitive leadership in his efforts to bring fairness to the government interaction with aboriginal people, but rather it is to the Minister of Energy.

Last Friday, Energy Probe released a statement claiming that Ontario Hydro was providing a discount rate to large industrial consumers of 2.4 cents per kilowatt-hour. Is Ontario Hydro providing these kinds of discounts for big power users?

Hon Ms Carter: I want to thank my colleague for giving me this opportunity to clear up a misunderstanding. The overall average cost of power for large industrial customers in Ontario is not 2.4 cents per kilowatt-hour, as Energy Probe claims. It was 4.1 cents per kilowatt hour in 1990 and the corresponding number in 1991 will be about 4.4 cents a kilowatt-hour.

All rates offered by Ontario Hydro are published rates. All rates for industrial customers have been examined in detail by the Ontario Energy Board and none offers power below the cost of production. Energy Probe's calculation is based on a statement made by the lawyer for the Association of Major Power Consumers in Ontario at the demand-supply plan hearing. He stated that AMPCO members purchase approximately 21% of the electricity that Hydro produces—

The Speaker: Would the minister conclude her remarks, please?

Hon Ms Carter: —at a cost of roughly \$600 million per year. These figures are in error. They are based on data that are out of date by six or seven years.

1520

LONG-TERM CARE

Mrs McLeod: My question is for the Minister of Community and Social Services. We were rather surprised to note today on the minister's public agenda, which came out as a news release, that later this afternoon she will be attending a meeting of the policy and priorities board of cabinet in order to discuss long-term care. The reason that

we were surprised is because, as everyone in the House will be well aware, there was absolutely no mention of long-term care in the budget release last week and no indication of any ongoing commitment on the part of this government to long-term care reform.

The minister may not understand the level of concern that has created among representatives of seniors and of the disabled people across this community. They have been waiting with a great deal of anxiety to know what this government plans to do with long-term care, and to this point they have heard nothing.

These people need to know what the government's intents are. I would ask the minister whether she can tell us if specific proposals are being taken forward to policy and priorities board this afternoon and what those policies are or whether this is simply going to be an extension of the moratorium with another consultation.

Hon Ms Akande: In actual fact we have been quite busy in dealing with long-term care. It is another inter-ministerial initiative that has been taken on by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Citizenship, who is also responsible for senior citizens' affairs, and myself. We have in fact very quickly, after being appointed, taken the document Strategies for Change, taken those responses to that, looked at it and decided on some alterations, some differences and some ways in which we thought the system might operate better.

We are in fact designing—and have practically completed that design—a consultation paper which would allow for the people out there to have an opportunity to respond to what it is that we will be applying. The previous government did go out with its paper. It was not a consultation; it was information sessions. I was a part of it.

Mrs McLeod: I am sure the minister is aware that there is not a lot of point in carrying on a consultation about reform if in fact there is no real support to be forthcoming from this government, which raises the issue of any funding commitment for long-term care in the province over the next year.

We were informed by Treasury officials during the budget lockup last week that there is an increase of \$102 million in this budget for long-term care. Is any of the \$102 million new money? If it is, why was there no reference to it in the budget? If it is not new money, what is the purpose in proceeding with the consultation about reform?

Hon Ms Akande: Let me answer the second part of the question first, because it leads more naturally into the response. The purpose of proceeding with the consultation is that one of the things that was very, very much emphasized to us is that people felt strongly that they should have a say in the system that was going to affect their lives, that service providers also felt extremely strongly about the service system they were going to contribute to and that in fact the information sessions that had been held by the previous government did not allow for real consultation in order for people to make those views known. Therefore, we have decided to take that, plus the changes, to the public. The financial means to monitor and to take it through that consultation are definitely there.

MINISTERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr Harris: I have a question to the Minister of Community and Social Services. I would like to read her a quote from her newsletter to St Andrews-St Patrick, paid for by the taxpayers. She said, "We'll make mistakes, but we'll admit them."

This is good rhetoric. This is exactly what the public is looking for in political leadership. They are looking for human beings. They are looking for people who do not pretend they are above them. I think it is something that is important, something I have talked about for a great deal of time.

I wonder if, to show us this is not just rhetoric, she would tell us some of the mistakes she has made.

Hon Ms Akande: I really do appreciate the opportunity to use this House as a confessional, but I would rather not.

Mr Harris: The question is quite simple. She is the Minister of Community and Social Services. She has been there now for some seven months. If this is not just rhetoric, could she tell us some of the mistakes she has made?

Hon Ms Akande: My attention, like the attention of my colleagues, has been far too focused in addressing the needs of the people in this province, on responding to the needs that they have and making appropriate recommendations. That is where I have spent my time.

Mr Speaker: Unhappily or otherwise, the time for oral questions has expired.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mr Cousens: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d). On 22 November I tabled an Orders and Notices paper question, number 55, in the House, which reads as follows, "Would the Minister of Citizenship list the three travel agencies with which the ministry placed the greatest portion of its travel business for fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89, 1989-90 and the year-to-date."

Standing order 95(d) states, "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

The order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost four months since I tabled the question and we have as yet been told only that we would receive the answer on or about 15 April 1991. We have now passed that date and we are now in a position to begin to question whether or not this government has any intention of answering the question that has been placed on that order paper.

I see this as a reflection of the government's response to myself. It is an important question, because with that

information we will be able to look at the former deputy minister, what he has been doing and various other matters.

I would hope, Mr Speaker, there would be something that you can do to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario.

The Speaker: The member for Markham will be no doubt pleased to know that he has a valid point of order. He may be even more pleased, of course, if the minister, who has heard these remarks, will be able to comply with the standing orders as quickly as possible.

Mr J. Wilson: I too have an important point of order regarding responses to order paper questions. On 22 November I tabled an Orders and Notices paper. It was number 341 and it reads, "Would the Minister of Tourism and Recreation provide the Strategic Plan for the ministry for each of the past five years, as well as the Strategic Forecast for 1991."

It was tabled, as I said, on 22 November 1990. An interim answer was tabled on 13 December 1990. It said that the information would be available on 28 December and so far I have not heard or seen any response to that order paper question.

Under standing order 95(d), it states:

"The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

1530

I am wondering, on my point of order here today, whether the minister is declining to answer, since I was supposed to have the information by 28 December. Order paper questions, as I said, are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost six months since I tabled this question. An interim answer was provided, as I said, on 13 December, but that has not been forthcoming. It has now been five months since the date that the information was to be made available.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)(6), which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof, access to information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people and, more important in this case, as the Ontario Progressive Conservative Party's critic for Tourism and Recreation.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering this question, and I ask that you take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. I am a little taken aback that I would have to get up and remind you of your

responsibility at this point and I ask you to take my concerns into consideration.

The Speaker: The member for Simcoe West will be similarly pleased that he has raised indeed a valid point of order. He will be even more pleased I am sure when the minister to whom he addressed his concerns will respond and uphold the standing orders.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d). I would like to say that on 22 November 1990 I tabled order paper question 116, which reads as follows,

"Would the Minister of Culture and Communications list the three travel agencies with which the minister placed the greatest portion of its travel business for fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89, 1989-90 and the year to date. November 22, 1990."

I would note at this time that there is actually a typographical error in the printed order. Under the year 1987 they have it printed as 1897. I think it would be important to have that corrected in future printings of that order paper question.

Standing order 95(d) states: "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

Order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has now been almost six months since it was tabled. I would also like to say that an interim answer was provided on 11 December 1990, but that answer predicted that the information would be available on 26 April 1991. It has now been about 15 days since that date that the information would be made available.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)(6), which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof.

As a member of this assembly, I feel that I have the right to access to information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering my question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: You have indeed a valid point of order. I trust that the minister has heard the remarks you have made and will comply with the standing orders as soon as possible.

Hon Mr Cooke: On this point of order, I certainly sympathize with the members of the third party. I still have

an order paper question from back in 1978 in the Davis government that has not been answered.

I would like to say that we are doing the very best we can to respond to the over 400 order paper questions that the opposition has put on the order paper. We are going to respond as quickly as we can, but the third party should understand that if we are going to answer these questions immediately, we will have to hire hundreds more civil servants at a cost of millions of dollars to the taxpayers, and we are trying to protect the public purse.

The Speaker: The member for York Mills.

Mr Cousens: Mr Speaker, on a point of order.

The Speaker: The member for York Mills, I believe, rose on a point of order.

Mr Cousens: I want to speak to this point of order.

The Speaker: To the member for Markham, I recognized the member for York Mills. He has a point of order.

Mr Turnbull: I would point out that my colleague would like to speak to that point of order, and I think you should deal with that before I bring my point of order.

Mr Cousens: As deputy House leader as well, I appreciate the support.

I just have to go on record when you hear the statement that is made by the acting House leader of the government. The fact of the matter is that this House has a set of rules that we are living and working within. The government has accepted those rules, and now it is absolutely disregarding the rights of the members on this side of the House by not responding to the questions in the time frame that has been agreed upon in the standing orders. I therefore take the position that what the Minister of Housing has given in defence of the government is totally unacceptable.

If in fact he is trying to change the rules of this House in the middle of the game, it is wrong. We will not accept it. I take it as a very serious affront to our rights in opposition to be able to defend those rights. If he is saying that the government is not about to honour those rules now, then it is now causing us to have great second thoughts on how this House can work. We are in the process of trying to do our duty. It is obvious that they are not doing theirs.

The Speaker: The point of order was raised earlier. The member for York Mills, a new point of order?

Mr Turnbull: Yes. I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d). On 22 November 1990, I tabled order paper question 253, which reads as follows:

"Inquiry of the ministry: Would the Chairman of Management Board provide copies of all reports prepared by and for the ministry on the capital and human resource costs of the government's decentralization program. November 22, 1990. Interim answer tabled 11 December 1990. Approximate date information available, 25 January 1991."

Standing order 95(d) states: "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question

indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

1540

Order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost four and a half months since I tabled this question. An interim answer was provided on 11 December 1990, but that answer predicted that the information would be available on 25 January 1991. It has now been approximately three and a half months since the date that information was to be made available.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act 45(1)6 which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal to produce papers before the assembly or the committee thereof.

As a member of this assembly, I feel that I have a right to access to information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering the question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: To the member for York Mills, he indeed raises a valid point of order, and no doubt his remarks have been heard by the minister affected and he should anticipate, I would hope, a speedy response to his point of order.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL

LOI ENQUÊTANT LES MOULES ZÉBRÉES ZEBRA MUSSEL ACT

M. Harris propose la première lecture du projet de loi 95, Loi réclamant la ministre de l'Environnement de libérer ses responsabilités sous l'article 15(1) de la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario afin de déterminer le contenu des moules zébrées du :

Mr Harris: I move that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled An Act to require the Minister of the Environment to discharge her responsibilities under section 15(1) of the Ontario Water Resources Act to determine the Zebra Mussel content of Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Canal Lake, Canard Lake, Canard River, Canary Lake, Cancer Lake, Candide Creek, Candide Lake, Candler Lake, Candybar Creek, Candybar Lake, Candy Creek, Cane Lake, Canisbay Creek, Canisbay Lake, Canis Lake, Canister Creek, Canister Lake, Can Lake, Canna Creek, Canna Lake, Cannard's Bay, Canniff Creek, Canniff Lake, Canning Lake, Cannings Falls, Cannon Creek, Cannon Lake, Canoe Bay, Canoe Bay Channel, Canoe Channel, Canoe Creek, Canoe Lake, Canoeshed Lake, Canon Creek, Canon Lake, Canonto Lake, Can Opener Lake, Canterbury Lake, Canthook Lake, Cantin Lake, Cantley Creek, Cantley Lake, Canton Lake, Cantrill Lake, Canty Lake, Canvasback Lake, Canyon Creek, Canyon Falls, Canyon Lake, Canyon

River, Cap Creek, Capee Lake, Cape Harbour, Cape Hurd Channel, Capella Lake, Capin Lake, Cap Lake, Capper Lake, Capre Lake, Capreol Lake, Capricornus Lake, Capsell Lake, Captain Lake, Captains Lake, Captain Tom Lake, Capton Lake, Caput Lake, Carafel Creek, Carafel Lake, Caragana Lake, Caramat Creek, Caramat Lake, Carcajou Bay, Carcajou Creek, Carcajou Lake, Carcass Lake, Card Bay, Carder Lake, Cardiff Creek, Cardiff Lake, Cardinal Creek—

Mrs Cunningham: You're going too fast. Slow down, Mike, we are trying to—

Mr Harris: Are members missing some of these in their ridings?

Mrs Cunningham: Yes, we are.

Mr Harris: All right; Cardinalis Lake, Cardinal Lake, Card Lake, Cards Lake, Cardwell Lake, Carew Lake, Carey Creek, Carey Lake, Carfrae Lake, Cargill Lake, Cargill Mill Pond, Carhess Creek, Cariad Lake, Carib Creek, Carib Lake, Cariboo Creek, Cariboo Lake, Caribou Bay, Caribou Creek, Caribou Lake, Caribou Rapids, Caribou River, Caribou Throat Lake, Caribus Lake, Carillon Rapids, Carkner Lake, Car Lake, Carl Bay, Carlbom Lake, Carl Creek, Carleton Lake, Carling Bay, Carling Lake, Carl Lake, Carlo Lake, Carlson Lake, Carlstead Bay, Carlton Lake, Carlyle Lake, Carman Bay, Carman Creek, Carman Lake, Carmichael Lake, Carnachan Bay, Carnahan Lake, Carney Creek, Carney Lake, Carnilac Lake, Caro Lake, Caroline Lake, Carol Lake, Carolyn Creek, Caron Creek, Caron Lake, Carpenter Lake, Carpenter River, Carpet Lake, Carp Lake, Carp River, Carre Lake, Carrick Creek, Carrick Lake, Carrie Lake, Carrie Lake, Carriere Lake, Carrigan Lake, Carrington Lake, Carroll Creek, Carroll Lake, Carroll Wood Bay, Carrot Lake, Carruthers Lake, Carrying Lake, Carry Lake, Carscallen Lake, Carson Bay, Carson Creek, Carson Lake, Carss Creek, Carstens Lake, Carswell Lake, Cartan Lake, Carter Bay, Carter Lake, Carter Rapids, Carthew Bay, Cartier Lake, Cartier Creek, Cart Lake, Cartwrights Creek, Carty Creek, Carty Lake, Carver Lake, Cascade Falls, Cascade Lake, Cascaden Lake, Cascade Rapids, Cascade River, Cascanette Lake, Case River, Casey Creek, Casey Lake, Casgrain Creek, Casgrain Lake, Cash Creek, Cashel Lake, Cashman Creek, Cashore Creek, Casino Lake, Caskie Bay, Caskill Lake, Cask Lake, Casper Lake, Casque Lake, Cassdaga Lake, Casselman's Lake and Casselman's Creek, Cassels Lake, Cassidy Bay, Cassidy Creek, Cassidy Lake, Cassidy's Bay, Cass Lake, Casson Lake, Castellar Creek, Castellar Lake, Castlebar Creek, Castlebar Lake, Castle Bay, Castle Creek, Castle Lake, Castleman Lake, Castlewood Creek, Castlewood Lake, Castor Creek, Castor Lake, Castoroil Lake, Castor Ponds—

Mr Johnson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I was wondering if the leader of the third party could slow down somewhat because the haste with which he is reading these names makes it very difficult for me assimilate them.

1550

The Deputy Speaker: The leader of the third party.

Mr Harris: On the point of order, I understand the member's problem. It fits in exactly with how I would have felt. He, along with his colleagues and the Treasurer, is able to assimilate information. I will try to respect his wishes and slow down.

Castor Ponds, Castor River, Castra Lake, Casummit Lake, Caswell Bay, Caswell Lake, Cataract Falls, Cataract Lake, Cataraqui Bay, Cataraqui River, Catastrophe Creek, Catastrophe Lake, Catawba Lake, Cat Bay, Catchacoma Lake, Catcher Lake, Cat Creek, Caterpillar Lake, Cat Falls, Catfish Bay, Catfish Creek, Catfish Lake, Catfish Rapids, Catharine Lake, Cathro Lake, Cathy's Lake, Catlonite Creek, Catlonite Lake, Cat River, Cat Tail River, Catral Lake, Cauchon Creek, Cauchon Lake, Caulfield Lake, Cauley Lake, Cauliflower Creek, Cauliflower Lake, Caulkin Lake, Caution Lake, Cavalary Creek, Cavalary Lake, Cavanagh Lake, Cavan Creek, Cavano Lake, Cave Harbour, Cave Lake, Cavell Creek, Cavell Lake, Cavenish Lake, Caverly's Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Creek, Cavers Lake, Caviar Lake, Cawanogami Lake, Cawdron Creek, Cawdron Lake, Cawing Lake, Cawston Lakes, Cawthra Creek, Caya's Lake, Cayer Creek, Cayer Lake, Cayiens Creek, Caysee Lake, Cayuga Creek, Cayuga Lake, Cebush Lake, Cecebe Lake, Cecil Creek, Cecile Lake, Cedar Bay, Cedarbough Lake, Cedarclump Lake, Cedar Creek, Cedar Falls, Cedargum Lake, Cedar Harbour, Cedar Lake, Cedar Rapids, Cedar River, Cedarskirt Lake, Cedric Lake, Cee Creek.

Interjection.

Mr Harris: If members are having difficulty with pronunciation, when I do them in French it might be clearer.

Then we have Ceepee Lake.

Mr Mammoliti: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am speaking not only for the government but I think I am speaking for the public out there. What the third party is doing is absolutely ridiculous.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. On your point of order.

Mr Mammoliti: As I was saying before I was rudely interrupted, the third party is being ridiculous. The stalling tactics have to stop. This is a prime example of why they have not been in government for the longest time. People are sick and tired of it. People are swamping my office with phone calls.

The Deputy Speaker: Take your seat. This is not a point of order. Do you have a point of order?

Mr Jackson: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I do believe, though, that the member for Yorkview is expressing concern because he is currently under investigation by the standing committee on administration of justice. I would assume he would prefer to be in the justice committee this afternoon discussing his conflict-of-interest allegations. That is of interest to many citizens in this province, and yet he would—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. There is no point in keeping a debate this way. We all know that.

The leader of the third party is introducing a bill. Procedure dictates to us that we have to listen to his introduction of bills.

Mr Harris: I am sorry the member for Yorkview was not able to get a free apartment at taxpayers' expense, but if that bothers him, what the heck.

If I could carry on: Ceepee Lake, Celastruc Lake, Celtist Lake, Celt Creek, Celtis Lake, Celt Lake, Cemetery Creek, Cemetery Lake, Centennial Lake, Centralis Creek, Centralis Lake, Central Lake, Centre Channel, Centre Creek, Centre Falls, Centrefire Creek, Centrefire Lake, Centre Lake, Centreville Creek, Ceph Lake, Ceres Lake, Cerulean Lake, Cerullo Lake, Chabbie Lake, Chabbie River, Chabot Lake, Chadwick Lake, Chagma Lake, Chagnon Lake, Chaillon Lake, Chain Creek, Chain Lake, Chain Lakes, The Chain of Lakes, Chainy Creek, Chainy Lake, Chair Lake; Chalet Creek, Chalet Lake, Chalice Lake, Chalk Bay, Chalk Creek, Chalkend Lake, Chalk Lake, Chalk River, Challener Lake, Challener River, Challis Lake, Chalmers Lake, Chamandy Lake, Chamberlain Lake, Chamber Lake, Chambers Lake, Champagne Lake, Champlain Creek, Champlain Trail Lakes, Chance Lake, Chancellor Lake, Chandos Lake, Change Lake, Chanley Lake, Channel Lake, Channel Lakes; Green River, Greenrod Lake, Greens Bay, Green's Creek, Greenshields Lake, Greenshore Lake, Greensides Lake, Greens Lake, Greenstone Rapids, Greensward Lake, Green Tree Lake, Greenwater Creek, Greenwater Lake, Greenwich Creek, Greenwich Lake, Greenwood Lake, Greenwood River, Greer Creek, Greer Lake, Greers Bay, Greggio Lake, Greggs Lake, Gregory Bay, Gregory Creek, Gregory Lake, Grehan Lake, Greig Lake, Gremm Lake, Grenadier Creek, Grenadier Lake, Grenadier Pond, Grenfell Lake, Grenier Lake, Grenville Lake, Greske Lake, Greta Lake, Gretchel Creek, Gretchel Lake, Gretel Creek, Gretel Lake, Grew Lake, Grew River, Grey Duck Lake, Grey Lake, Grelava Lake, Grey Owl Bay, Grey Owl Lake, Green Creek, Greengrass Lake, Greenheart Creek, Greenheart Lake, Greenhedge Lake, Greenhill Lake, Greenhill Rapids, Greenhill River, Greenhorn Bay, Greenhue Lake, Greening Lake, Greening's Bay, Greenish Creek, Greenish Lake, Green Island Bay, Green Island Lake, Green Lake, Green Lakes, Greenland Lake, Greenlaw Lake, Greenleaf Creek, Greenleaf Lake, Greenlee Lake, Greenmantle Lake, Greenmantle River, Greenock Creek, Greenock Lake, Greenough Harbour, Greenpike Lake, Gravel Lake, Gravel Lakes, Gravelly Bay, Gravelpit Lake, Gravel Pit Pond, Gravelridge Lake, Gravel River, Gravenor Lake, Graves Lake, Graveyard Creek, Graveyard Lake, Graveyard Rapids, Gravy Lake, Grawbarger Lake, Grawbarger's Rapids, Graydarl Lake, Graydon Lake, Gray Lake, Grayling Lake, Graymud Lake, Gray Rapids, Grays Bay, Grays Creek, Grays Lake, Grayson Lake, Grayson River, Grays River, Graystone Lake, Graytrout Lake, Grazing Lake, Grazing River, Great Lake, Great Mountain Lake, Great North Bay, Great Portage Lake, Great South Bay, Grebe Lake, Greb Lake, Green Bay, Greenbough Lake, Green Bug Lake, Greenbush Lake, Green Creek, Grants Lake, Granzies

Lake, Grape Lake, Graphic Creek, Graphic Lake, Graphite Lake, Grapnel Bay, Grapnel Creek, Grapnel Lake, Grasett Lake, Grass Creek, Grasser Lake, Grass Hill Lake, Grass Lake, Grassy Bay, Grassy Creek, Grassy Lake, Grassy Portage Bay, Grassy River, Gratton Creek, Gratton Lake, Grave Bay, Grave Creek, Grave Lake, Gravel Bay, Gravel Beach Lake, Gravel Falls, Graham Bay, Graham Creek, Graham Lake, Grahams Creek, Graham's Lake, Granary Creek, Granary Lake, Grand Bay, Grand Campment Bay, Grande Lake, Grandeur Lake, Grand Lake, Grandmaison Lake, Grandma Lake, Grandma Stevens Pond, Grandolph Bay, Grandpa Lake, Grandpop's Lake, Grand Rapids, Grand River, Grandview Lake, Granite Bay, Graniteboss Lake, Granite Creek, Granite Falls, Granitell Lake, Granite Lake, Granite River, Granitic Lake, Granka Lake, Granny Bay, Granny's Creek, Grano Lake, Grant Bay, Grant Creek, Grant Lake, Grant Point Harbour, Grants Creek, Grants Creek Bay, Gosselin Creek, Gosselin Lake, Gosselin's Bay, Goss Lake, Goudreau Creek, Goudreau Lake, Goudy Creek, Goudy Lake, Gough Creek, Gough Lake, Gouinlock Lake, Gouin Lake, Goulais Bay, Goulais Lake, Goulais River, Gould Creek, Goulding Lake, Goulet Bay, Goulet Creek, Goulet Lake, Gourd Lake, Gourlay Lake, Gourlie Creek, Govan Lake, Gove Lake, Gover Lake, Government Bay, Government Creek, Government Lake, Governor Bay, Gowan Creek, Gowan Lake, Goward Bay, Goward Lake, Gowganda Bay, Gowganda Lake, Gowie Bay, Grabers Lake, Grab Lake, Grace Bay, Grace Creek, Graceful Lake, Grace Lake, Gracie Lake, Grady Lake, Graff Lake, Goose Lake, Goose Neck Bay, Goose-neck Creek, Gooseneck Lake, Gooseneck Rapids, Goose Pond, Goose River, Gord Lake, Gordon Bay, Gordon Creek, Gordon Lake, Gordon Rapids, Gordons Bay, Gordons Creek, Gore Bay, Gorge Creek, Gorge Creek Falls, Gorge Lake, Gorman Creek, Gorman Lake, Gorman River, Gormans Creek, Gormire Lake, Gormley Creek, Gornupkagama Lake, Gorrie Lake, Gorr Lakes, Gorse Creek, Gorse Lake, Gort Creek, Gort Lake, Goshawk Lake, Goshen Lake, Gosling Lake, Goldie Lake, Goldie River, Goldilocks Lake, Golding Lake, Gold Lake, Gold Mountain Lake, Goldsborough Creek, Goldsborough Lake, Gold Seekers Bay, Goldsmith Lake, Goldspink Lake, Goldstein Lake, Goldthrope Lake, Goldwin Creek, Goldwin Lake, Golf Course Bay, Golf Lake, Goltz Lake, Golub Lake, Gong Creek, Gong Lake, Gooch Creek, Gooch Lake, Goodchild Creek, Goodchild Lake, Goode Lake, Goodens Creek, Gooderham Creek, Gooderham Lake, Goodeve Lake, Goodfish Lake, Good Fortune Lake, Good Harbour, Goodie Creek, Goodie Lake, Goodier Lake, Goodkey Creek, Goodlad Lake, Good Lake, Goodliff Lake, Goodman Creek, Goodman Lake, Goodmorning Lakes, Goodoar Lake, Goodreau Lake, Goods Lake, Goodwill Lake, Goodwin Lake, Gooley Lake, Goosander Creek, Goosander Lake, Goose Bay, Gooseberry Brook, Gooseberry Creek, Gooseberry Lake, Goose Channel, Goose Creek, Goose Egg Lake, Gilder Creek, Gilder Lake, Glimmer Lake, Gling Lake, Gliskning Lake, Glitter Creek, Glitter Lake, Globe Creek, Globe Lake, Gloomy Lake, Glorious Lake, Glory Creek,

Glory Lake, Glosser Bay, Gloucester Pool, Glover Bay, Glover Lake, Glovers Bay, Glue Lake, Glynn Lake, Gnat Lake, Gneiss Lake, Gneiss Rapids, Gnome Lake, Goat Creek, Goat Island Channel, Goat Lake, Goat River, Goblin Bay, Goblin Lake, Godda Lake, Goddard Lake, Godfrey Creek, Godfrey Lake, Godin Creek, Godin Lake, God's Lake, Godson Creek, Godson Lake, Goff Lake, Gog Lake, Gohere Bay, Go Home Bay, Go Home Lake, Go Home River, Going Lake, Golborne Lakes, Goldbar Lake, Gold Creek, Golden Creek, Goldeneye Lake, Golden Gate Lake, Golden Lake, Goldfield Creek, Goldfield Lake, Glass Falls, Glass Lake, Glassy Creek, Glassy Lake, Glay Lake, Glaze Lake, Gleason Brook, Gleason Lake, Gleave Lake, Gledhill Lake, Gleeson Lake, Glen Creek, Glendenning Lake, Glen Erin Brook, Glenfield Creek, Glen Lake, Glenney Creek, Glenney Lake, Glenn Lake, Gillies Creek, Gillies Lake, Gilligan Creek, Gillin Lake, Gill Lake, Gillmor Lake, Gillnet Lake, Gill's Bay, Gilman Bay, Gilman Lake, Gilmour Bay, Gilmour Creek, Gilmour Lake, Gilroy Lake, Gilson Lake, Gilt Lake, Gimby Lake, Gimlet Lake, Gina Lake, Gin Creek, Ginger Lake, Gin Lake, Ginn Lake, Ginozhe Bay, Gipsy Lake, Giraffe Creek, Giraffe Lake, Girardin Pond, Girard Lake, Girdlestone Bay, Giroux Creek, Giroux Lake, Giroux River, Girty Lake, Girvan Creek, Girvan Lake, Girvin Lake, Gitche Lake, Gitche River, Gittins Lake, Giunta Lake, Giving Lake, Giwshkwebi Bay, Glabb Lake, Glacier Creek, Glacier Lake, Glade Lake, Gladstone Lake, Gladwin Creek, Gladwin Lake, Gladys Lake, Glaister Creek, Glaister Lake, Gilmor Lake, Glanmire Creek, Glanmire Lake, Glasford Lake, Glasgow Lake, Glasgow Pond, Glass By, Glasser Lake, Gessie Lake, Ghee Lake, Ghost Bay, Ghost Creek, Ghost Lake, Ghost River, Giacomo Lake, Gibbery Lake, Gibb Lake, Gibboney Lake, Gibbons Lake, Gibbons Lake, Gibi Lake, Gibraltar Bay, Gibraltar Lake, Gibson Creek, Gibson Lake, Gibson River, Gibsons Bay, Gibsons Lake, Gids Harbour, Giffins Lake, Gifford Bay, Gifford Lake, Gignac Lake, Giguere Lake, Gilbert Creek, Gilbert Lake, Gilboe Lake, Gilby Lake, Gilchrist Bay, Gilchrist Creek, Gilchrist Lake, Gilden Lake, Gills Bay, Gilhuly Lake, Gillard Lake, Gilleach Lake, Gilleran Lake, Genessee Bay, Genessee Lake, Geneva Creek, Geneva Lake, Genier Creek, Genier Lake, Gennis Lake, Genoa Creek, Genoa Lake, Genricks Lake, Gention Creek, Gention Lake, Gentleman Creek, Geoffrey Lake, Geoffrion Lake, Geometry Lake, Geordie Lake, Geordies Lake, George Creek, George Lake, Georges Bay, George's Lake, Georgia Lake, Georgian Bay, Georgie Creek, Georgina Lake, Geraldine Lake—

Mr Mammoliti: On a point of order: I just want to remind the leader of the third party that he is holding up a number of injured workers, who are waiting for committee to start, because of his tactics—rude, insensitive tactics, mind you. This, Mr Speaker, has got to stop. There are a number of people waiting to start committee and because of the leader of the third party it is not happening.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. This is not a point of order.

Mrs Marland: On the same point of order: I feel it is singularly significant that this member has now risen in the House on two so-called points of order, only to be told that they are not points of order. I would be ashamed if I had served in this House for the amount of time that he has—

The Deputy Speaker: Would you take your seat, please? The leader of the third party.

Mr Harris: I thank the member for Yorkview for the little break. I am sorry the taxpayers will not give him an apartment. I believe I—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There are procedures and we have to follow the procedures. These procedures apply to all of us.

Mr Harris: Before I was rudely interrupted with that time-wasting point of order: Geraldine Lake, Gerald Lake, Gerber Lake, Gerloch Creek, German Bay, German Lake, German Mills Creek, Gerow Lake, Gerrard Lake, Gerry Creek, Gerry Lake, Gertrude Lake, Gervais Lake, Gervis Lake; Alfreda Creek, Alfreda Island, Alfreda Lake, Alfred Inlet, Alfred Lake, Algocen Lake, Algonquin Lake, Alguire Lake, Alice Creek, Alice Lake, Alike Lake, Alister Lake, Aljo Lake, Alkenore Lake, Allan Creek, Allan Lake—

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr Harris: —Allan Rapids, Callans Creek, Allard Lake, Allely Creek, Allely Lake, Allenby Creek, Allenby Lake, Allen Creek, Allen Lake, Allen Lakes, Allen Rapids, Allens Creek, Allens Lakes, Alligator Creek, Alligator Lake, Allingham Creek, Allin Lake, Allison Lake, Allman's Bay, Allumette Lake, Alluring Creek, Alma Creek, Alma Lake, Almas Bay, Alm Lake, Almond Lake, Almonte Lake, Almonte Rapids, Aloft Lake, Along Bay, Alona Bay Creek, Alonghill Lake, Alpha Lake, Alph Creek, Alph Lake, Alphonse Bay, Alpine Lake, Alport Lake, Alps Creek, Alsever Lake, Alstone Lake, Altar Lake, Altimeter Creek, Altimeter Lake, Altitude Lake, Altitude Creek, Alto Lake, Alton Lake, Alva Lake, Alves Bay, Alvin Lake, Alwyn Lake, Amabel Creek, Amable du Fond River, Amable Lakes, Amaleen Lake, Amateewakea River, Amberley Beach, Ambrose Lake, Ambursh Bay, Amelia Lake, Ameliasbury Mill Pond, Ament Bay, American Cabin Lake, American Channel, Ames Creek, Amesdale Lake, Ames Lake, Ameson Creek, Ameson Lake, Amethyst Bay, Amethyst Harbour, Amethyst Lake, Amewin River, Amherst Bay, Amherstbury Harbour, Amikeus Creek, Amikeus Lake, Amik Lake, Amikogaming Lake, Amikougami Creek, Amik River, Amisk Creek, Amit Lake, Amlin Lake, Amoeba Lake, Amos Creek, Amos Lake, Amphibolite Bay, Amp Lake, Amra Lake, Amundsen Creek, Amwri Creek, Amwri Lake, Amy Falls, Amy Lake, Amylou Lake, Amyoa Creek, Amyoa Lake, Amyot Creek, Anaharea Creek, Anaharea Lake, Anahareo Creek, Anahareo Lake, Ana Lake, Anape Lake, Anaway Creek, Anaway Lake, Ancaster Creek, Anchicum Bay, Anchorage Bay, Anchor Lake, Ancliff Lake, Ancona Bay, Anders Lake, Anderson Creek, Anderson Lake, Anderson's

Bay, Andre Creek, Andre Lake, Andress Lake, Andrew Bay, Andrew Lake, Andrews Bay, Caba Lake, Cabin Bay, Cabin Lake, Cabin Rapids, Cab Lake, Cable Creek, Cable Lake, Caboose Lake, Cabot Lake, Cache Bay, Cache Creek, Cachege Lake, Cache Lake, Cache Rapids, Cache River, Cadawaja Creek, Cadawaja Lake, Caddy Creek, Caddy Lake, Cadre Lake, Caesar Lake, Cahill Creek, Cahill Lake, Caibaiosai Lake, Cain Lake, Cairngorm Lake, Cairn Lake, Cairns Lake, Cairns River, Cairo Creek, Cairo Lake, Caithness Creek, Caithness Lake, Calabogie Lake, Calais Creek, Calais Lake, Calamity Creek, Calamity Lake, Calbeck Lake, Calbert Creek, Calcite Lake, Calcite Creek, Calcite Rapids, Cal Creek, Calder Creek, Calder Lake, Caldwell Lake, Caledon Creek, Caledonia Creek, Caledon Lake, Caley Lake, Calf Lake, Calf Rapids, Calhoun Lake, Caliper Lake, Callaghan Lake, Callahan Bay, Callahan Lake, Cal Lake, Callander Bay, Callery Lake, Callicut Lake, Callinan Lake, Call Lake, Calm Bay, Calm Lake, Calong Lake, Calpin Lake, Calstock Creek, Calstock Lake, Calumet Lake, Calverley's Pond, Calvert Creek, Calvert Lake, Calvin Lake, Calvin Falls, Camden Lake, Camel Lake, Camelot Lake, Camel Read Lake, Cameo Lake, Cameron Bay, Cameron Creek, Cameron Falls, Cameron Lake, Camerons Bay, Camerons Lake, Cameron's Pool, Cameroon Lake, Cam Lake, Cammack Lake, Camp Bay, Campbell Bay, Campbell Creek, Campbell Lake, Campbell's Bay, Campbell's Creek, Campbellville Pond, Campcot Lake, Camp Creek, Camp Eleven Lake, Camper Creek, Camp Lake, Camp Falls, Camp 50 Bay, Campfire Creek, Campfire Lake, Campfire River, Camp Five Lake, Camp Four Lake, Camp 14 Creek, Camp 14 Lake, Campground Lake, Camphouse Lake, Camping Lake, Campion Rapids, Camp Island Lake, Camp Lake, Camp Nine Creek, Camp Nine Lake, Camp One Bay, Camp One Lake, Campover Lake, Camp River, Camproad Creek, Camproad Lake, Camp 7 Bay, Camp 7 Lake, Camp 6 Bay, Camp Six Lake, Camp Six Rapids, Campstool Lake, Campten Bay, Camp Ten Bay, Camp Ten Lake, Camp 36 Lake, Camp Three Bay, Camp Three Lake, Camp Three Rapids, Camp Two Lake, Campus Creek, Campus Lake, Camrose Lake, Canada Jay Lake, Canadensis Lake, Canadian Channel, Canagagigue Creek, Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Aaron Creek, Aaron Lake, Abalard Creek, Abamasagi Lake, Abamategwia Lake, Abams Lake, Abate Lake, Abbe Creek, Abbe Lake, Abbess Lake, Abbey Creek, Abbey Dawn Creek, Abbey Lake, Abbie Lake, Abbotsford Creek, Abbotsford Lake, Abbott Creek, Abbott Lake, Abe Creek, Abelson Lake, Aberarder Creek, Aber Creek, Aberdeen Creek, Aberdeen Lake, Aberfoyle Creek, Aber Lake, Abernethy Lake, Abes Lake, Abie Lake, Abigogami Creek, Abigogami Lake, Abimatinu Lake, Abimatinu River, Abinette Lake, Abinette River, Abitibi River, Abitibi Lake, Abney Lake, Abram Lake, Abs Lake, Acanthus Lake, Ace Lake, Acer Lake, Achapi Lake, Acheson Lake, Achigan Creek, Achigan Lake, Acid Lake, Acker Lake, Ackert Drain, Acme Lake, Acolyte Lake, Aconda Lake, Acorn Lake, Acre Lake, Acton Lake, Acton Pond, Adagio Lake, Adair Creek, Adair Lake, Ada Lake, Adamac Lake, Adam Creek, Adamhay Lake, Adam Lake, Adam's Bay,

Adams Creek, Adams Lake, Adamson Lake, Adams Pond, Adams River, Adams River Bay, Adanac Lake, Adanac Creek, Addie Lake, Addington Lake, Addison Lake, Add Lake, Adelaide Creek, Adelaide Lake, Adelard Lake, Adele Lake, Adel Lake, Adik Creek, Adik Lake, Adios Lake, Admiral Creek, Admiral Lake, Admit Lake, Adobe Lake, Adogio Lake, Adrains Creek, Adrian Lake, Adrienne Lake, Adventure Creek, Adventure Lake, Adze Lake, Aegean Creek, Aegean Lake, Aerial Lake, Aerobus Bay—

1630

Mr Mammoliti: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: A number of times the individuals who are holding up the House have brought up what we are doing as far as the Agenda for People is concerned. Some 13,000 workers are waiting for our wage protection bill, and they are holding it up with these antics.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. This is not a point of order.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: The member for Yorkview, I would ask you to keep quiet.

Interjections.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: One of the conditions of being a member in this Legislature is to know the rules of order, and I see that the whip for the government caucus is in the House at this time. It is also a rule of the House—for those members who are making interjections—that interjections are not permitted. Since the government whip is in the House, it might be advisable for her to help her members know the rules of order, that we do not have the continuous interruptions—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is the role of the Speaker to make sure that order is kept in the House. I thank you for the advice. I will make sure that I abide by some of the advice that you have given me, and I think I do a fairly good job. I would ask the leader of the third party to take over.

Mr Mammoliti: On that point of order, Mr Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Please take your seat. If you have a legitimate point of order, I will accept it. Do you have a legitimate point of order?

Mr Mammoliti: I do not know.

The Deputy Speaker: Let me listen to it.

Mr Mammoliti: The point of order is this: She has made all kinds of accusations and I say to you that I do—

The Deputy Speaker: Please take your seat.

Interjections.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. This is your time.

Mrs Marland: Mr Speaker, I have a point of privilege: I take strong exception to the comments of the member for Yorkview. I feel that he is infringing on my privilege by standing in this House saying that I am making "all kinds of accusations," and I quote his comment. I would ask that he stand in this House and withdraw that comment against my previous statement.

The Deputy Speaker: I do not see any point for the member for Yorkview to make any excuse whatsoever.

Mr Harris: I am sorry the member for Yorkview did not get the extra money for his apartment that he wanted to change all the rules for, but if he is still upset with that, then what the heck.

I think I left off at—Mr Speaker, I thank you for maintaining order. I think you are doing a fine job in very trying circumstances—Aerobus Creek, Aerobus Lake, Aerofoil Lake, Aeroplane Lake, Affleck Lake, A-Frame Lake, Again River, Agam Lake, Agar Lake, Agassiz Lake, Agate Creek, Agate Lake, Agawa Bay, Agawa Lake, Agawa River, Agawask Creek, Agimak Lake, Agnes Lake, Agnes River, Agnew Lake, Agonzon Lake, Agreen Lake, Aguasabon River, Aguasabon Lake, Ague Lake, Agusada Creek, Agusada Lake, Agusk Lake, Agutua Lake, Agutua River, Agwa Bay, Agwasuk River, Agwatik River, Ahdik Lake, Ahern Lake, Ahmabel Lake, Ahme Lake, Ahme Creek, Ahmic Creek, Ahmic Lake, Ahsin Bay, Ahsine Creek, Ahsine Lake, Aide Creek, Aide Lake, Aidie Creek, Aikens Lake, Aikman Lake, Aileen Lake, Ainslie Lake, Air Base Bay, Aird Bay, Aird Lake, Airfield Creek, Air Hole Lake, Airplane Lake, Airport Drain, Airport Lake, Airstrip Lake, Airy Creek, Airy Lake, Aitken Creek, Aitken Lake, Ajax Lake, Akandamo Lakes, Akandamo River, Akebia Creek, Akebia Lake, Akey Lake, Aki Lake, Aikin Lakes, Akonesi Creek, Akonesi Lake, Akonewi Lake, Akow Lake, Akron Creek, Akron Lake, Alabama Lake, A Lake, Alaska's Lake, Alba Lake, Albany River, Cox Bay, Cox Creek, Cox Lake, Cox's Lake, Coy Lake, Coyle Creek, Coyle Lake, Coyne Lake, Coyston Lake, CPR Bay, Crabcrawl Creek, Crabclaw Lake, Crab Lake, Crabtree Lake, Cracknell Lake, Crackshot Lake, Craddock Creek, Craddock Lake, Cradle Creek, Cradle Lake, Craft Creek, Craft Lake, Crag Lake.

I see we have changed Speakers. I would like to welcome the new Speaker to the chair and thank the previous Speaker for maintaining order with this rowdy group.

I believe I was at Craft Lake, Crag Lake, Craig Lake, Caignative Lake, Craigs Creek, Craig's Swamp, Crain Lake, Crains Lake, Cramadog Creek, Cramadog Lake, Cramp Creek, Cramp Lake, Cranberry Bay, Cranberry Creek, Cranberry Lake, Chenier Lake, Cherie Creek, Cherniuk Lake, Cherries Bay, Cherrington Lake, Cherry Creek, Cherry Lake, Cherry River, Chesakan Creek, Chesakan Lake, Chesley Lake, Chesney Bay, Chesterfield Bay, Chesterfield Creek, Chesterfield Lake, Chester Lake, Chewink Creek, Chewink Lake, Chiah Lake, Chiblow Lake, Chicago Bay, Chicault Lake, Chickadee Lake, Chicken Farm Lake, Chicken Liver Channel, Chick Lake, Chicobi Lake, Chicot Lake, Chief Bay, Chief Creek, Chief Lake, Chief Peter, Chief's Creek, Chiki Lake, Chilcott Lake, Childerhorse Creek, Childerhorse Lake, Chill Creek, Chill Lake, Chilton Lake, Chimahagan River, Chime Lake, China Lake, Chin Creek, Chiniguchi River, Chiniguchi Lake, Chin Lake, Chin River, Chipai River, Chipai Lake, Chipchase Lake, Chipican Lake, Chip Lake, Chipman Lake, Chipmunk Creek, Chipmunk Lake, Chippawa Channel, Chippego Lake, Chippewa Creek, Chippy Lake, Chisamore Lake, Chisholm Drain, Chit Lake, Fade Lake,

Fagan Lake, Fagan Ponds, Fagus Bay, Fahey Lake, Fairbairn Creek, Fairbairn Lake, Fairbanks Creek, Fairchild Creek, Fairchild Lake, Faircloth Lake, Fairholme Lake, Fair Lake, Fairloch Lake, Fairplay Lake, Fairs Creek, Fairview Creek, Fairy Creek, Fairy Lake, Faith Lake, Fakeloo Lake, Fakeloo Creek, Falan Lake, Falby Lake, Falcon Lake, Fall Creek, Fallduck Lakes, Fallen Creek, Fallen Lake, Fall-In-Lake, Fallis Pond, Fall Lake, Fallon Island, Falloon Lake, Fall River, Fallscamp Creek, Fallscamp Lake, Falls Lake, Falls River, False Creek, False Lake, Falsetto Lake, Fan Lake, Fanny Lake, Fanshawe Lake, Fansher Lake, Faraday Creek, Faraday Lake, Farah Lake, Farden Lake, Farewell Bay, Farewell Lake, Faries Lake, Faris Lake, Farlain Lake, Far Lake, Farlane Lake, Farlette Lake, Farley Lake, Farleys Creek, Farlinger Lake, Farm Bay, Farm Bay Lake, Farm Creek, Farmer Lake, Farm Lake, Farncomb Lake, Farncomb Creek, Farner Lake, Farnes Lake, Farnham Creek, Farquhar Creek, Farquhar Lake, Farr Creek, Farrel Creek, Farrel Lake, Farrell Lake, Farrer Lake, Farrington Lake, Farrington Creek, Farrow Lake, Farwell Creek, Fassett Lake, Fatima Lake, Fat Lake, Fat River, Fatty Creek, Fatty Lake, Faubert Lake, Faulkenham Lake, Faulk Lake, Faulkner Lake, Fault Creek, Fault Lake, Faultside Lake, Fauquier Lake, Favel Bay, Favel Lake, Favell Bay, Favot Creek, Fawcett Lake, Fawn Creek, Fawn Lake, Fawthrop Lake, Faya Lake, Feagan Lake, Fear Lake, Fearless Lake, Feather Lake, Feather River, Feaver Lake, Fecteau Lake, Fee Lake, Feely Creek, Feely Lake, Feeny Lake, Feist Creek, Feist Lake, Felcite Lake, Feldman Lake, Feline Lake, Felix Lake, Fells Bay—

Mr Huget: Veronica Lake.

Mr Harris: We are three days away from getting to Veronica Lake, but pardon that aside.

Felsen Creek, Felsen Lake, Felst Lake, Felt Lake, Felto Lake, Fenelon River, Fen Lake, Fennah Lake, Fennell Lake, Fenn Lake, Fenson Lake, Fenton Lake, Fergus Lake, Fergus Creek, Ferguson Lake, Ferguson Bay, Ferguson Creek, Ferguson Drain, Fergusons Lake, Ferland's Lake, Fermoy Lake, Fern Creek, Ferndale Bay, Fern Lake, Fernley Drain, Fernlund Lake, Fernow Lake, Fernow River, Ferns Lake, Ferrier Creek, Ferrie River, Ferrim Lake, Ferris Lake, Festuca Lake, Fetter Lake, Fewster Drain, Fib Lake, Ficht Lake, Fiddler Lake, Fidler River, Fido Lake, Field's Lake, Fife Lake, Fifteen Lake, Fifteen Mile Creek, Fifteen Mile Lake, Fifteen Mile Pond, Fifth Lake, Fifty Creek, Fifty Dollar Lake, Fifty Nine Lake, Fifty Two Lake, Fillet Creek, Fillet Lake, Fillion Lake, Fills Lake, Film Lake, Filter Creek, Filter Lake, Final Lake, Fin Bay, Finch Lake, Fin Creek, Findlay Creek, Findlay Creek, Findlay Lake, Fine Lake, Finger Bay, Finger Lake, Finish Lake, Fink Lake, Fin Lake, Finland Creek, Finlay Bay, Finlay Creek, Finlayson Creek, Finlayson Lake, Finnegan Lake, Finney Creek, Finney Lake, Finn Lake, Finton Lake, Fintry Creek, Fire Creek, Firefly Creek, Firefly Lake, Fire Hill Creek, Fire Hill Lake, Fire Lake, Fireline Lake, Firella Creek, Fire River, Firesand River, Firesteel River, Firetail Creek, Firetail Lake, Fir Lake, Firman's Creek, First Concession Drain, First Creek,

First Depot Lake, First Egan Lake, First Government Lake, First James Lake, First Justin Lake, First Kargus Lake, First Lake, First Loon Creek, First Loon Lake, Firth Creek, Firth Lake, Fischer Lake, Fishbasket Lake, and that it now be read the first time.

1650

The Acting Speaker (Mr Villeneuve): Mr Harris moves that leave be given to introduce a bill entitled An Act to require the Minister of the Environment to discharge her responsibilities under Section 15(1) of the Ontario Water Resources Act to determine the Zebra Mussel content of Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Canal Lake, Canard Lake, Canard River, Canary Lake, Cancer Lake, Candide Creek, Candide Lake, Candler Lake, Candybar Creek, Candybar Lake, Candy Creek, Cane Lake, Canisbay Creek, Canisbay Lake, Canis Lake, Canister Creek, Canister Lake, Can Lake, Canna Creek, Canna Lake, Cannard's Bay, Canniff Creek, Canniff Lake, Canning Lake, Canning's Falls, Cannon Creek, Cannon Lake, Canoe Bay, Canoe Bay Channel, Canoe Channel, Canoe Creek, Canoe Lake, Canoeshed Lake, Canon Creek, Canon Lake—

Mr Klopp: On a point of personal privilege, Mr Speaker: In the interest of the pages, if you wish to read the whole thing when most of us have already heard it, would there be any chance that at least we could have our pages sit down and not have to stand, please?

The Acting Speaker: That is not a point of personal privilege, as I am sure the member understands.

Mr Grandmaitre: Consideration.

The Acting Speaker: It is a point of consideration, that is right. Is it the pleasure of the House that the pages may be seated during the rather lengthy reading of this motion?

Agreed to.

The Acting Speaker: We have unanimous agreement. The pages may be seated if they so desire.

—Canonto Lake, Can Opener Lake, Canterbury Lake, Canthook Lake, Cantin Lake, Cantley Creek, Cantley Lake, Canton Lake, Cantrill Lake, Canty Lake, Canvasback Lake, Canyon Creek, Canyon Falls, Canyon Lake, Canyon River, Cap Creek, Cape Lake, Cape Harbour, Cape Hurd Channel, Capella Lake, Capin Lake, Cap Lake, Capper Lake, Capre Lake, Capreol Lake, Capricornus Lake, Capsell Lake, Captain Lake, Captains Lake, Captain Tom Lake, Capton Lake, Caput Lake, Carafel Creek, Carafel Lake, Caragana Lake, Caramat Creek, Caramat Lake, Carcajou Bay, Carcajou Creek, Carcajou Lake, Carcass Lake, Card Bay, Carder Lake, Cardiff Creek, Cardiff Lake, Cardinal Creek, Cardinalis Lake, Cardinal Lake, Card Lake, Cards Lake, Cardwell Lake, Carew Lake, Carey Creek, Carey Lake, Carfrae Lake, Cargill Lake, Cargill Mill Pond, Carhess Creek, Cariad Lake, Carib Creek, Carib Lake, Cariboo Creek, Cariboo Lake, Caribou Bay, Caribou Creek, Caribou Lake, Caribou Rapids, Caribou River, Caribou Throat Lake, Caribus Lake, Carillon Rapids, Carkner Lake, Car Lake, Carl Bay, Carlbom Lake, Carl Creek, Carleton Lake, Carling Bay, Carling Lake, Carl Lake, Carlo Lake, Carlson Lake, Carstead Bay, Carl-

ton Lake, Carlyle Lake, Carman Bay, Carman Creek, Carman Lake, Carmichael Lake, Carnachan Bay, Carnahan Lake, Carney Creek, Carney Lake, Carnilac Lake, Caro Lake, Caroline Lake, Carol Lake, Carolyn Creek, Caron Creek, Caron Lake, Carpenter Lake, Carpenter River, Carpet Lake, Carp Lake, Carp River, Carre Lake, Carrick Creek, Carrick Lake, Carrie Lake, Carriere Lake, Carrigan Lake, Carrington Lake, Carroll Creek, Carroll Lake, Carroll Wood Bay, Carrot Lake, Carruthers Lake, Carrying Lake, Carry Lake, Carscallen Lake, Carson Bay, Carson Creek, Carson Lake, Carss Creek, Carstens Lake, Carswell Lake, Cartan Lake, Carter Bay, Carter Lake, Carter Rapids, Carthew Bay, Cartier Lake, Cartier Creek, Cart Lake, Cartwrights Creek, Carty Creek, Carty Lake, Carver Lake, Cascade Falls, Cascade Lake, Cascaden Lake, Cascade Rapids, Cascade River, Cascanette Lake, Case River, Casey Creek, Casey Lake, Casgrain Creek, Casgrain Lake, Cash Creek, Cashel Lake, Cashman Creek, Cashore Creek, Casino Lake, Caskie Bay, Caskill Lake, Cask Lake, Casper Lake, Casque Lake, Cassdaga Lake, Casselman's Lake, Casselman's Creek, Cassels Lake, Cassidy Bay, Cassidy Creek, Cassidy Lake, Cassidys Bay, Cass Lake, Casson Lake, Castellar Creek, Castellar Lake, Castelbar Creek, Castelbar Lake, Castel Bay, Castle Creek, Castle Lake, Castleman Lake, Castlewood Creek, Castlewood Lake, Castor Creek, Castor Lake, Castoroil Lake, Castor Ponds, Castor River, Castra Lake, Casummit Lake, Caswell Bay, Caswell Lake, Cataract Falls, Cataract Lake, Cataract Bay, Cartaraqui River, Catastrophe Creek, Catastrophe Lake, Catawba Lake, Cat Bay, Catchacoma Lake, Catcher Lake, Cat Creek, Caterpillar Lake, Cat Falls, Catfish Bay, Catfish Creek, Catfish Lake, Catfish Rapids, Catharine Lake, Cathro Lake, Cathy's Lake, Catlonite Creek, Catlonite Lake, Cat River, Cat Tail River, Catral Lake, Cauchon Creek, Cauchon Lake, Caufield Lake, Cauley Lake, Cauliflower Creek, Cauliflower Lake, Caulkin Lake, Caution Lake, Cavalary Creek, Cavalary Lake, Cavanagh Lake, Cavan Lake, Cavano Lake, Cave Harbour, Cave Lake, Cavell Creek, Cavell Lake, Cavendish Lake, Caverly's Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Bay, Cavers Creek, Cavers Lake, Caviar Lake, Cawanogami Lake, Cawdron Creek, Cawdron Lake, Cawing Lake, Cawston Lakes, Cawston Lakes, Cawthra Creek, Caya's Lake, Cayer Creek, Cayer Lake, Cayiens Creek, Caysee Lake, Cayuga Creek, Cayuga Lake, Cebush Lake, Cecebe Lake, Cecil Creek, Cecile Lake, Cedar Bay, Cedarbough Lake, Cedarclump Lake, Cedar Creek, Cedar Falls, Cedargum Lake, Cedar Harbour, Cedar Lake, Cedar Rapids, Cedar River, Cedarskirt Lake, Cedric Lake, Cee Creek, Ceepee Lake, Celastruc Lake, Cellist Lake, Celt Creek, Celtis Lake, Celt Lake, Cemetery Creek, Cemetery Lake, Centennial Lake, Centralis Creek, Centralis Lake, Central Lake, Centre Channel, Centre Creek, Centre Falls, Centrefire Creek, Centrefire Lake, Centre Lake, Centreville Creek, Ceph Lake, Ceres Lake, Cerulean Lake, Cerullo Lake, Chabbie Lake, Chabbie River, Chabot Lake, Chadwick Lake, Chagma Lake, Chagnon Lake, Chaillon Lake, Chain Creek, Chain Lake, Chain Lakes, The Chain of Lakes, Chainy Creek, Chainy Lake, Chair Lake, Chalet Creek,

Chalet Lake, Chalice Lake, Chalk Bay, Chalk Creek, Chalkend Lake, Chalk Lake, Chalk River, Challener Lake, Challener River, Challis Lake, Chalmers Lake, Chamandy Lake, Chamberlain Lake, Chamber Lake, Chambers Lake, Champagne Lake, Champlain Creek, Champlain Trail Lakes, Chance Lake, Chancellor Lake, Chandos Lake, Change Lake, Chanley Lake, Channel Lake, Channel Lakes, Green River, Greenrod Lake, Greens Bay, Green's Creek, Greenshields Lake, Greenshore Lake, Greensides Lake, Greens Lake, Greenstone Rapids, Greensward Lake, Green Tree Lake, Greenwater Creek, Greenwater Lake, Greenwich Creek, Greenwich Lake, Greenwood Lake, Greenwood River, Greer Creek, Greer Lake, Greers Bay, Greggio Lake, Greggs Lake, Gregory Bay, Gregory Creek, Gregory Lake, Grehan Lake, Greig Lake, Gremm Lake, Grenadier Creek, Grenadier Lake, Grenadier Pond, Grenfell Lake, Grenier Lake, Grenville Lake, Greske Lake, Greta Lake, Gretchel Creek, Gretchel Lake, Gretel Creek, Gretel Lake, Grew Lake, Grew River, Grey Duck Lake, Grey Lake, Grelava Lake, Grey Owl Bay, Grey Owl Lake, Green Creek, Greengrass Lake, Greenheart Creek, Greenheart Lake, Greenhedge Lake, Greenhill Lake, Greenhill Rapids, Greenhill River, Greenhorn Bay, Greenhue Lake, Greening Lake, Greening's Bay, Greenish Creek, Greenish Lake, Green Island Bay, Green Island Lake, Green Lake, Green Lakes, Greenland Lake, Greenlaw Lake, Greenleaf Creek, Greenleaf Lake, Greenlee Lake, Greenmantle Lake, Greenmantle River, Greenock Creek, Greenock Lake, Greenough Harbour, Greenpike Lake, Gravel Lake, Gravel Lakes, Gravelly Bay, Gravelpit Lake, Gravel Pit Pond, Gravelridge Lake, Gravel River, Gravenor Lake, Graves Lake, Graveyard Creek, Graveyard Lake, Graveyard Rapids, Gravy Lake, Grawbarger Lake, Grawbarger's Rapids, Graydar Lake, Graydon Lake, Gray Lake, Grayling Lake, Graymud Lake, Gray Rapids, Grays Bay, Grays Creek, Grays Lake, Grayson Lake, Grayson River, Grays River, Graystone Lake, Graytrout Lake, Grazing Lake, Grazing River, Great Lake, Great Mountain Lake, Great North Bay, Great Portage Lake, Great South Bay, Grebe Lake, Greb Lake, Green Bay, Greenbough Lake, Green Bug Lake, Greenbush Lake, Green Creek, Grants Lake, Granzies Lake, Grape Lake, Graphic Creek, Graphic Lake, Graphite Lake, Grapnel Bay, Grapnel Creek, Grapnel Lake, Grasett Lake, Grass Creek, Grasser Lake, Grass Hill Lake, Grass Lake, Grassy Bay, Grassy Creek, Grassy Lake, Grassy Portage Bay, Grassy River, Gratton Creek, Gratton Lake, Grave Bay, Grave Creek, Grave Lake, Gravel Bay, Gravel Beach Lake, Gravel Falls, Graham Bay, Graham Creek, Graham Lake, Grahams Creek, Graham's Lake, Granary Creek, Granary Lake, Grand Bay, Grand Campment Bay, Grande Lake, Grandeur Lake, Grand Lake, Gradmaison Lake, Grandma Lake, Grandma Stevens Pond, Grandolph Bay, Grandpa Lake, Grandpop's Lake, Grand Rapids, Grand River, Grandview Lake, Granite Bay, Graniteboss Lake, Granite Creek, Granite Falls, Granitehill Lake, Granite Lake, Granite River, Granitic Lake, Granka Lake, Granny Bay, Granny's Creek, Grano Lake, Grant Bay, Grant Creek, Grant Lake, Grant Point Harbour, Grants Creek, Grants Creek Bay, Gosselin Creek, Gosselin Lake,

Gosselin's Bay, Goss Lake, Goudreau Creek, Goudreau Lake, Goudy Creek, Goudy Lake, Gough Creek, Gough Lake, Gouinlock Lake, Gouin Lake, Goulais Bay, Goulais Lake, Goulais River, Gould Creek, Goulding Lake, Goulet Bay, Goulet Creek, Goulet Lake, Gourd Lake, Gourlay Lake, Gourlie Creek, Govan Lake, Gove Lake, Gover Lake, Government Bay, Government Creek, Government Lake, Governor Bay, Gowan Creek, Gowan Lake, Gowar Bay, Goward Lake, Gowganda Bay, Gowganda Lake, Gowie Bay, Grabers Lake, Grab Lake, Grace Bay, Grace Creek, Graceful Lake, Grace Lake, Gracie Lake; Grady Lake, Graff Lake, Goose Lake, Goose Neck Bay, Goose-neck Creek, Gooseneck Lake, Gooseneck Rapids, Goose Pond, Goose River, Gord Lake, Gordon Bay, Gordon Creek, Gordon Lake, Gordon Rapids, Gordons Bay, Gordons Creek, Gore Bay, Gorge Creek, Gorge Creek Falls, Gorge Lake, Gorman Creek, Gorman Lake, Gorman River, Gormans Creek, Gormire Lake, Gormley Creek, Gornupkagama Lake, Gorrie Lake, Gorr Lakes, Gorse Creek, Gorse Lake, Gort Creek, Gort Lake, Goshawk Lake, Goshen Lake, Gosling Lake, Goldie Lake, Goldie River, Goldilocks Lake, Golding Lake, Gold Lake, Gold Mountain Lake, Goldsborough Creek, Goldsborough Lake, Gold Seekers Bay, Goldsmith Lake, Goldspink Lake, Goldstein Lake, Goldthorpe Lake, Coldwin Creek, Goldwin Lake, Golf Course Bay, Golf Lake, Goltz Lake, Golub Lake, Gong Creek, Gong Lake, Gooch Creek, Gooch Lake, Goodchild Creek, Goodchild Lake, Goode Lake, Goodens Creek, Gooderham Creek, Gooderham Lake, Goodeve Lake, Goodfish Lake, Good Fortune Lake, Good Harbour, Goodie Creek, Goodie Lake, Goodier Lake, Goodkey Creek, Goodlad Lake, Good Lake, Goodliff Lake, Goodman Creek, Goodman lake, Goodmorning Lakes, Goodoar Lake; Goodreau Lake, Goods Lake, Goodwill Lake, Goodwin Lake, Gooley Lake, Goosander Creek, Goosander Lake, Goose Bay, Gooseberry Brook, Gooseberry Creek, Gooseberry Lake, Goose Channel, Goose Creek, Goose Egg Lake, Gilder Creek, Gilder Lake, Glimmer Lake, Gling Lake, Gliskning Lake, Glitter Creek, Glitter Lake, Globe Creek, Globe Lake, Gloomy Lake, Glorious Lake, Glory Creek, Glory Lake, Glosser Bay, Gloucester Pool, Glover Bay, Glovers Lake, Glovers Bay, Glue Lake, Glynn Lake, Gnat Lake, Gneiss Lake, Gneiss Rapids, Gnome Lake, Goat Creek, Goat Island Channel, Goat Lake, Goat River, Goblin Bay, Goblin Lake, Godda Lake, Goddard Lake, Godfrey Creek, Godfrey Lake, Godin Creek, Godin Lake, God's Lake, Godson Creek, Godson Lake, Goff Lake, Gog Lake, Gohere Bay, Go Home Bay, Go Home Lake, Go Home River, Going Lake, Golborne Lakes, Goldbar Lake, Gold Creek, Golden Creek, Goldeneye Lake, Golden Gate Lake, Golden Lake, Goldfield Creek, Goldfield Lake, Glass Falls, Glass Lake, Glassy Creek, Glassy Lake, Glay Lake, Glaze Lake, Gleason Brook, Gleason Lake, Gleave Lake, Gledhill Lake, Gleeson Lake, Glen Creek, Glendening Lake, Glen Erin Brook, Glenfield Creek, Glen Lake, Glenney Creek, Glenney Lake, Glenn Lake, Gillies Creek, Gillies Lake, Gilligan Creek, Gillin Lake, Gill Lake, Gillmor Lake, Gillnet Lake, Gill's Bay, Gilman Bay, Gilman Lake, Gilmour Bay, Gilmour

Creek, Gilmour Lake, Gilroy Lake, Gilson Lake, Gilt Lake, Gimby Lake, Gimlet Lake, Gina Lake, Gin Creek, Ginger Lake, Gin Lake, Ginn Lake, Ginozhe Bay, Gipsy Lake, Giraffe Creek, Giraffe Lake, Girardin Pond, Girard Lake, Girdlestone Bay, Giroux Creek, Giroux Lake, Giroux River, Girty Lake, Girvan Creek, Girvan Lake, Girvin Lake, Gitche Lake, Gitche River, Gittins Lake, Giunta Lake, Giving Lake, Giwshkwebi Bay, Glabb Lake, Glacier Creek, Glacier Lake, Glade Lake, Gladstone Lake, Gladwin Creek, Gladwin Lake, Gladys Lake, Glaister Creek, Glaister Lake, Gilmor Lake, Glanmire Creek, Glanmire Lake, Glasford Lake, Glasgow Lake, Glasgow Pond, Glass Bay, Glasser Lake, Gessie Lake, Ghee Lake, Ghost Bay, Ghost Creek, Ghost Lake, Ghost River, Giacomo Lake, Gibberry Lake—

Mr Sterling: Dispense.

The Acting Speaker: Agreed? Dispense. We have unanimous consent.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: This is a bill entitled An Act to require the Minister of the Environment to discharge her responsibilities under Section 15(1) of the Ontario Water Resources Act to determine the zebra mussel content of Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Canal Lake, Canard Lake, Canard River, Canary Lake, Cancer Lake, Candide Creek—

An hon member: Dispense.

The Acting Speaker: There has to be unanimous consent of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that—

An hon member: No.

The Acting Speaker: No. Please, Mr Clerk, continue.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Candide Lake, Candler Lake, Candybar Creek, Candybar Lake, Candy Creek, Cane Lake, Canisbay Creek, Canisbay Lake, Canis Lake, Canister Creek, Canister Lake, Can Lake, Canna Creek, Canna Lake, Cannard's Bay, Canniff Creek, Canniff Lake, Canning Lake, Cannings Falls, Cannon Creek, Cannon Lake, Canoe Bay, Canoe Bay Channel, Canoe Channel, Canoe Creek, Canoe Lake, Canoeshed Lake, Canon Creek, Canon Lake, Canonto Lake, Can Opener Lake, Canterbury Lake, Canthook Lake, Cantin Lake, Cantley Creek, Cantley Lake, Canton Lake, Cantrill Lake, Canty Lake, Canvasback Lake, Canyon Creek, Canyon Falls, Canyon Lake, Canyon River, Cap Creek, Cape Lake, Cape Harbour, Cape Hurd Channel, Capella Lake, Capin Lake, Cap Lake, Capper Lake, Capre Lake, Capreol Lake, Capricornus Lake, Capsell Lake, Captain Lake, Captains Lake, Captain Tom Lake, Capton Lake, Caput Lake, Carafel Creek, Carafel Lake, Caragana Lake, Caramat Creek, Caramat Lake, Carcajou Bay, Carcajou Creek, Carcajou Lake, Carcass Lake, Card Bay, Carder Lake, Cardiff Creek, Cardiff Lake, Cardinal Creek, Cardinalis Lake, Cardinal Lake, Card Lake, Cards Lake, Cardwell Lake, Carew Lake, Carey Creek, Carey Lake, Carfrae Lake, Cargill Lake, Cargill Mill Pond, Carhess Creek, Cariad Lake, Carib Creek, Carib Lake, Cariboo Creek, Cariboo Lake, Caribou Bay, Caribou Creek, Caribou Lake, Caribou Rapids, Caribou River, Caribou Throat Lake, Caribus Lake, Carillon Rapids, Carkner Lake, Car Lake, Carl Bay, Carlbom

Lake, Carl Creek, Carleton Lake, Carling Bay, Carling Lake, Carl Lake, Carlo Lake, Carlson Lake, Carlstead Bay, Carlton Lake, Carlyle Lake, Carman Bay, Carman Creek, Carman Lake, Carmichael Lake, Carnachan Bay, Carnahan Lake, Carney Creek, Carney Lake, Carnilac Lake, Caro Lake, Caroline Lake, Carol Lake, Carolyn Creek, Caron Creek, Caron Lake, Carpenter Lake, Carpenter River, Carpet Lake, Carp Lake, Carp River, Carre Lake, Carrick Creek, Carrick Lake, Carrie Lake, Carriere Lake, Carrigan Lake, Carrington Lake, Carroll Creek, Carroll Lake, Carroll Wood Bay, Carrot Lake, Carruthers Lake, Carrying Lake, Carry Lake, Carscallen Lake, Carson Bay, Carson Creek, Carson Lake, Carss Creek, Carstens Lake, Carswell Lake, Cartan Lake, Carter Bay, Carter Lake, Carter Rapids, Carthew Bay, Cartier Lake, Cartier Creek, Cart Lake, Cartwrights Creek, Carty Creek, Carty Lake, Carver Lake, Cascade Falls, Cascade Lake, Cascaden Lake, Cascade Rapids, Cascade River, Cascanette Lake, Case River, Casey Creek, Casey Lake, Casgrain Creek, Casgrain Lake, Cash Creek, Cashel Lake, Cashman Creek, Cashore Creek, Casingo Lake, Caskie Bay, Caskill Lake, Cask Lake, Casper Lake, Casque Lake, Cassdaga Lake, Casselman's Lake, Casselman's Creek, Cassels Lake, Cassidy Bay, Cassidy Creek, Cassidy Lake, Cassidys Bay, Cass Lake, Casson Lake, Castellar Creek, Castellar Lake, Castlebar Creek, Castlebar Lake, Castel Bay, Castle Creek, Castle Lake, Castleman Lake, Castlewood Creek, Castlewood Lake, Castor Creek, Castor Lake, Castoroil Lake, Castor Ponds, Castor River, Castra Lake, Casummit Lake, Caswell Bay, Caswell Lake, Cataract Falls, Cataract Lake, Cataraqui Bay, Cataraqui River, Catastrophe Creek, Catastrophe Lake, Catawba Lake, Cat Bay, Catchacoma Lake, Catcher Lake, Cat Creek, Caterpillar Lake, Cat Falls, Catfish Bay, Catfish Creek, Catfish Lake, Catfish Rapids, Catharine Lake, Cathro Lake, Cathy's Lake, Catlonite Creek, Catlonite Lake, Cat River, Cat Tail River, Cattral Lake, Cauchon Creek, Cauchon Lake, Caufield Lake, Cauley Lake, Cauliflower Creek, Cauliflower Lake, Caulkin Lake, Caution Lake, Cavalary Creek, Cavalary Lake, Cavanagh Lake, Cavan Creek, Cavano Lake, Cave Harbour, Cave Lake, Cavell Creek, Cavell Lake, Cavendish Lake, Caverly's Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Bay, Cavers Creek, Cavers Lake, Caviar Lake, Cawanogami Lake, Cawdron Creek, Cawdron Lake, Cawing Lake, Cawston Lakes, Cawthra Creek, Caya's Lake, Cayer Creek, Cayer Lake, Cayiens Creek, Caysee Lake, Cayuga Creek, Cayuga Lake, Cebush Lake, Cecebe Lake, Cecil Creek, Cecile Lake, Cedar Bay, Cedarbough Lake, Cedarclump Lake, Cedar Creek, Cedar Falls, Cedargum Lake, Cedar Harbour, Cedar Lake, Cedar Rapids, Cedar River, Cedarskirt Lake, Cedric Lake, Cee Creek, Ceepee Lake, Celastruc Lake, Cellist Lake, Celt Creek, Celtis Lake, Celt Lake, Cemetery Creek, Cemetery Lake, Centennial Lake, Centralis Creek, Centralis Lake, Central Lake, Centre Channel, Centre Creek, Centre Falls, Centrefire Creek, Centrefire Lake, Centre Lake, Centreville Creek, Ceph Lake, Ceres Lake, Cerulean Lake, Cerullo Lake, Chabbie Lake, Chabbie River, Lake, Chabot Lake, Chadwick Lake, Chagma Lake, Chagnon Lake, Chaillon Lake, Chain Creek, Chain Lake, Chain Lakes,

The Chain Lakes, Chainy Creek, Chainy Lake, Chair Lake, Chalet Creek, Chalet Lake, Chalice Lake, Chalk Bay, Chalk Creek, Chalkend Lake, Chalk Lake, Chalk River, Challenger Lake, Challenger River, Challis Lake, Chalmers Lake, Chamandy Lake, Chamberlain Lake, Chamber Lake, Chambers Lake, Champagne Lake, Champlain Creek, Champlain Trail Lakes, Chance Lake, Chancellor Lake, Chandos Lake, Change Lake, Chanley Lake, Channel Lake, Channel Lakes, Green River, Greenrod Lake, Greens Bay, Green's Creek, Greenshields Lake, Greenshore Lake, Greensides Lake, Greens Lake, Greenstone Rapids, Greensward Lake, Green Tree Lake, Greenwater Creek, Greenwater Lake, Greenwich Creek, Greenwich Lake, Greenwood Lake, Greenwood River, Greer Creek, Greer Lake, Greers Bay, Greggio Lake, Greggs Lake, Gregory Bay, Gregory Creek, Gregory Lake, Grehan Lake, Greig Lake, Gremm Lake, Grenadier Creek, Grenadier Lake, Grenadier Pond, Grenfell Lake, Grenier Lake, Grenville Lake, Greske Lake, Greta Lake, Gretchel Creek, Gretchel Lake, Gretel Creek, Gretel Lake, Grey Lake, Grew River, Grey Duck Lake, Grey Lake, Grelava Lake, Grey Owl Bay, Grew Owl Lake, Green Creek, Greengrass Lake, Greenheart Creek, Greenheart Lake, Greenhedge Lake, Greenhill Lake, Greenhill Rapids, Greenhill River, Greenhorn Bay, Greenhue Lake, Greening Lake, Greening's Bay, Greenish Creek, Greenish Lake, Green Island Bay, Green Island Lake, Green Lake, Green Lakes, Greenland Lake, Greenlaw Lake, Greenleaf Creek, Greenleaf Lake, Greenlee Lake, Greenmantle Lake, Greenmantle River, Greenock Creek, Greenock Lake, Greenough Harbour, Greenpike Lake, Gravel Lake, Gravel Lakes, Gravelly Bay, Gravelpit Lake, Gravel Pit Pond, Gravelridge Lake, Gravel River, Gravenor Lake, Graves Lake, Graveyard Creek, Graveyard Lake, Graveyard Rapids, Gravy Lake, Grawbarger Lake, Grawbarger's Rapids, Graydarl Lake, Graydon Lake, Gray Lake, Grayling Lake, Graymud Lake, Gray Rapids, Gray's Bay, Grays Creek, Grays Lake, Grayson Lake, Grayson River, Grays River, Graystone Lake, Graytrout Lake, Grazing Lake, Grazing River, Great Lake, Great Mountain Lake, Great North Bay, Great Portage Lake, Great South Bay, Grebe Lake, Greb Lake, Green Bay, Greenbough Lake, Green Bug Lake, Greenbush Lake, Green Creek, Grants Lake, Granzies Lake, Grape Lake, Graphic Creek, Graphic Lake, Graphite Lake, Grapnel Bay, Grapnel Creek, Grapnel Lake, Grasett Lake, Grass Creek, Grasser Lake, Grass Hill Lake, Grass Lake, Grassy Bay, Grassy Creek, Grassy Lake, Grassy Portage Bay, Grassy River, Gratton Creek, Gratton Lake, Grave Bay, Grave Creek, Grave Lake, Gravel Bay, Gravel Beach Lake, Gravel Falls, Graham Bay, Graham Creek, Graham Lake, Grahams Creek, Graham's Lake, Granary Creek, Granary Lake, Grand Bay, Grand Campment Bay, Grande Lake, Grandeur Lake, Grand Lake, Grandmaison Lake, Grandma Lake, Grandma Stevens Pond, Grandolph Bay, Grandpa Lake, Grandpop's Lake, Grand Rapids, Grand River, Grandview Lake, Granite Bay, Graniteboss Lake, Granite Creek, Granite Falls, Granitehill Lake, Granite Lake, Granite River, Granitic Lake, Granka Lake, Granny Bay, Granny's Creek, Grano Lake, Grant Bay, Grant Creek,

Grant Lake, Grant Point Harbour, Grants Creek, Grants Creek Bay, Gosselin Creek, Gosselin Lake, Gosselin's Bay, Goss Lake, Goudreau Creek, Goudreau Lake, Goudy Creek, Goudy Lake, Gough Creek, Gough Lake, Gouinlock Lake, Gouin Lake, Goulais Bay, Goulais Lake, Goulais River, Gould Creek, Goulding Lake, Goulet Bay, Goulet Creek, Goulet Lake, Gourlay Lake, Goullie Creek, Govan Lake, Gove Lake, Gover Lake, Government Bay, Government Creek, Government Lake, Governor Bay, Gowan Creek, Gowan Lake, Gowar Bay, Goward Lake, Gowganda Bay, Gowganda Lake, Gowie Bay, Grabers Lake, Grab Lake, Grace Bay, Grace Creek, Graceful Lake, Grace Lake, Gracie Lake, Grady Lake, Graff Lake, Goose Lake, Goose Neck Bay, Gooseneck Creek, Gooseneck Lake, Gooseneck Rapids, Goose Pond, Goose River, Gord Lake, Gordon Bay, Gordon Creek, Gordon Lake, Gordon Rapids, Gordons Bay, Gordons Creek, Gore Bay, Gorge Creek, Gorge Creek Falls, Gorge Lake, Gorman Creek, Gorman Lake, Gorman River, Gormans Creek, Gormire Lake, Gormley Creek, Gornupkagama Lake, Gorrie Lake, Gorr Lakes, Gorse Creek, Gorse Lake, Gort Creek, Gort Lake, Goshawk Lake, Goshen Lake, Gosling Lake, Goldie Lake, Goldie River, Goldilocks Lake, Golding Lake, Gold Lake, Gold Mountain Lake, Goldsborough Creek, Goldsborough Lake, Gold Seekers Bay, Goldsmith Lake, Goldspink Lake, Goldstein Lake, Goldthrope Lake, Goldwin Creek, Goldwin Lake, Golf Course Bay, Golf Lake, Goltz Lake, Golub Lake, Gong Creek, Gong Lake, Gooch Creek, Gooch Lake, Goodchild Creek, Goodchild Lake, Goode Lake, Goodens Creek, Gooderham Creek, Gooderham Lake, Goodeve Lake, Goodfish Lake, Good Fortune Lake, Good Harbour, Goodie Creek, Goodie Lake, Goodier Lake, Goodkey Creek, Goodlad Lake, Good Lake, Goodliff Lake, Goodman Creek, Goodman Lake, Goodmorning Lakes, Goodoar Lake, Goodreau Lake, Goods Lake, Goodwill Lake, Goodwin Lake, Gooley Lake, Goosander Creek, Goosander Lake, Goose Bay, Gooseberry Brook, Gooseberry Creek, Gooseberry Lake, Goose Channel, Goose Creek, Goose Egg Lake, Gilder Creek, Gilder Lake, Glimmer Lake, Gling Lake, Gliskning Lake, Glitter Creek, Glitter Lake, Globe Creek, Globe Lake, Gloomy Lake, Glorious Lake, Glory Creek, Glory Lake, Glosser Bay, Gloucester Pool, Glover Bay, Glover Lake, Glovers Bay, Glue Lake, Glynn Lake, Gnat Lake, Gneiss Lake, Gneiss Rapids, Gnome Lake, Goat Creek, Goat Island Channel, Goat Lake, Goat River, Goblin Bay, Goblin Lake, Godda Lake, Goddard Lake, Godfrey Creek, Godfrey Lake, Godin Creek, Godin Lake, God's Lake, Godson Creek, Godson Lake, Goff Lake, Gog Lake, Gohere Bay, Go Home Bay, Go Home Lake, Go Home River, Going Lake, Golborne Lakes, Goldbar Lake, Gold Creek, Golden Creek, Goldeneye Lake, Golden Gate Lake, Golden Lake, Goldfield Creek, Goldfield Lake, Glass Falls, Glass Lake, Glassy Creek, Glassy Lake, Glay Lake, Glaze Lake, Gleason Brook, Gleason Lake, Gleave Lake, Gledhill Lake, Gleeson Lake, Glen Creek, Glendening Lake, Glen Erin Brook, Glenfield Creek, Glen Lake, Glenney Creek, Glenney Lake, Glenn Lake, Gillies Creek, Gillies Lake, Gilligan

Creek, Gillin Lake, Gill Lake, Gillmor Lake, Gillnet Lake, Gill's Bay, Gilman Bay, Gilman Lake, Gilmour Bay, Gilmour Creek, Gilmour Lake, Gilroy Lake, Gilson Lake, Gilt Lake, Gimby Lake, Gimlet Lake, Gina Lake, Gin Creek, Ginger Lake, Gin Lake, Gin Lake, Ginozhe Bay, Gipsy Lake, Giraffe Creek, Giraffe Lake, Girardin Pond, Girard Lake, Girdlestone Bay, Giroux Creek, Giroux Lake, Giroux River, Girty Lake, Girvan Creek, Girvan Lake, Girvin Lake, Gitche Lake, Gitche River, Gittins Lake, Giunta Lake, Giving Lake, Giwshkwebi Bay, Glabb Lake, Glacier Creek, Glacier Lake, Glade Lake, Gladstone Lake, Gladwin Creek, Gladwin Lake, Gladys Lake, Glaister Creek, Glaister Lake, Gilmor Lake, Glanmire Creek, Glanmire Lake, Glasford Lake, Glasgow Lake, Glasgow Pond, Glass Bay, Glasser Lake, Gessie Lake, Ghee Lake, Ghost Bay, Ghost Creek, Ghost Lake, Ghost River, Giacomo Lake, Gibberry Lake, Gibb Lake, Gibboney Lake, Gibbons Lake, Gibi Lake, Gibraltar Bay, Gibraltar Lake, Gibson Creek, Gibson Lake, Gibson River, Gibsons Bay, Gibsons Lake, Gids Harbour, Giffins Lake, Gifford Bay, Gifford Lake, Gignac Lake, Giguere Lake, Gilbert Creek, Gilbert Lake, Gilboe Lake, Gilby Lake, Gilchrist Bay, Gilchrist Creek, Gilchrist Lake, Gilden Lake, Giles Bay, Gilhuly Lake, Gillard Lake, Gilleach Lake, Gilleran Lake, Genessee Bay, Genessee Lake, Geneva Creek, Geneva Lake, Genier Creek, Genier Lake, Gennis Lake, Genoa Creek, Genoa Lake, Genricks Lake, Gentian Creek, Gentian Lake, Gentleman Creek, Geoffrey Lake, Geoffrion Lake, Geometry Lake, Geordie Lake, Geordies Lake, George Creek, George Lake, Georges Bay, George's Lake, Georgia Lake, Georgian Bay, Georgie Creek, Georgina Lake, Geraldine Lake, Gerald Lake, Gerber Lake, Gerloch Creek, German Bay, German Lake, German Mills Creek, Gerow Lake, Gerrard Lake, Gerry Creek, Gerry Lake, Gertrude Lake, Gervais Lake, Gervis Lake, Alfreda Creek, Alfreda Island, Alfreda Lake, Alfred Inlet, Alfred Lake, Algocen Lake, Algonquin Lake, Alguire Lake, Alice Creek, Alice Lake, Alike Lake, Alister Lake, Alijo Lake, Alkenore Lake, Allan Creek, Allan Lake, Allan Rapids, Callans Creek, Allard Lake, Allely Creek, Allely Lake, Allenby Creek, Allenby Lake, Allen Creek, Allen Lake, Allen Lakes, Allen Rapids, Allens Creek, Allens Lakes, Alligator Creek, Alligator Lake, Allingham Creek, Allin Lake, Allison Lake, Allman's Bay, Allumette Lake, Alluring Creek, Alma Creek, Alma Lake, Almas Bay, Alm Lake, Almon Lake, Almonte Lake, Almonte Rapids, Aloft Lake, Along Bay, Alona Bay Creek, Alonghill Lake, Alpha Lake, Alph Creek, Alph Lake, Alphonse Bay, Alpine Lake, Alport Lake, Alps Creek, Alsever Lake, Alston Lake, Altar Lake, Altimeter Creek, Altimeter Lake, Altitude Lake, Altitude Creek, Alto Lake, Alton Lake, Alva Lake, Alves Bay, Alvin Lake, Alwyn Lake, Amabel Creek, Amable du Fond River, Amable Lakes, Amaleen Lake, Amateewakea River, Amberley Beach, Ambrose Lake, Ambush Bay, Amelia Lake, Ameliasbury Mill Pond, Ament Bay, American Cabin Lake, American Channel, Ames Creek, Amesdale Lake, Ames Lake, Ameson Creek, Ameson Lake, Amethyst Bay, Amethyst Harbour, Amethyst Lake, Amewin River, Amherst Bay, Amherstbury Harbour, Amikeus Creek, Amikeus Lake, Amik Lake, Amikogaming

Lake, Amikougami Creek, Amik River, Amisk Creek, Amit Lake, Amlin Lake, Amoeba Lake, Amos Creek, Amos Lake, Amphibolite Bay, Amp Lake, Amra Lake, Amundsen Creek, Amwri Creek, Amwri Lake, Amy Falls, Amy Lake, Amylou Lake, Amyoa Creek, Amyoa Lake, Amyot Creek, Anaharea Creek, Anaharea Lake, Anahareo Creek, Anahareo Lake, Ana Lake, Anape Lake, Anaway Creek, Anaway Lake, Ancaster Creek, Anchicum Bay, Anchorage Bay, Anchor Lake, Ancliff Lake, Ancona Bay, Anders Lake, Anderson Creek, Anderson Lake, Anderson's Bay, Andre Creek, Andre Lake, Address Lake, Andrew Bay, Andrew Lake, Andrews Bay, Caba Lake, Cabin Bay, Cabin Lake, Cabin Rapids, Cab Lake, Cable Creek, Cable Lake, Caboose Lake, Cabot Lake, Cache Bay, Cache Creek, Cachege Lake, Cache Lake, Cache Rapids, Cache River, Cadawaja Creek, Cadawaja Lake, Caddy Creek, Caddy Lake, Cadre Lake, Caesar Lake, Cahill Creek, Cahill Lake, Caibaosai Lake, Cain Lake, Cairngorm Lake, Cairn Lake, Cairns Lake, Cairns River, Cairo Creek, Cairo Lake, Caithness Creek, Caithness Lake, Calabogie Lake, Calais Creek, Calais Lake, Calamity Creek, Calamity Lake, Calbeck Lake, Calbert Creek, Calcite Lake, Calcite Creek, Calcite Rapids, Cal Creek, Calder Creek, Calder Lake, Caldwell Lake, Caledon Creek, Caledonia Creek, Caledon Lake, Caley Lake, Calf Lake, Calf Rapids, Calhoun Lake, Caliper Lake, Callaghan Lake, Callahan Bay, Callahan Lake, Cal Lake, Callander Bay, Callery Lake, Callicut Lake, Callinan Lake, Call Lake, Calm Bay, Calm Lake, Calong Lake, Calpin Lake, Calstock Creek, Calstock Lake, Calumet Lake, Calverley's Pond, Calvert Creek, Calvert Lake, Calvin Lake, Calvin Falls, Camden Lake, Camel Lake, Camelot Lake, Camel Read Lake, Cameo Lake, Cameron Bay, Cameron Creek, Cameron Falls, Cameron Lake, Camerons Bay, Camerons Lake, Cameron's Pool, Cameroon Lake, Cam Lake, Cammack Lake, Camp Bay, Campbell Bay, Campbell Creek, Campbell Lake, Campbell's Bay, Campbell's Creek, Campbellville Pond, Campcot Lake, Camp Creek, Camp Eleven Lake, Camper Creek, Camp Lake, Camp Falls, Camp 50 Bay, Campfire Creek, Campfire Lake, Campfire River, Camp Five Lake, Camp Four Lake, Camp 14 Creek, Camp 14 Lake, Campground Lake, Camphouse Lake, Camping Lake, Campion Rapids, Camp Island Lake, Camp Lake, Camp Nine Creek, Camp Nine Lake, Camp One Bay, Camp One Lake, Campover Lake, Camp River, Camproad Creek, Camproad Lake, Camp 7 Bay, Camp 7 Lake, Camp 6 Bay, Camp Six Lake, Camp Six Rapids, Campstool Lake, Campton Bay, Camp Ten Bay, Camp Ten Lake, Camp 36 Lake, Camp Three Bay, Camp Three Lake, Camp Three Rapids, Camp Two Lake, Campus Creek, Campus Lake, Camrose Lake, Canada Jay Lake, Canadensis Lake, Canadian Channel, Canagagigue Creek, Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Aaron Creek, Aaron Lake, Abalard Creek, Abamasagi Lake, Abamategwia Lake, Abams Lake, Abate Lake, Abbe Creek, Abbe Lake, Abbess Lake, Abbey Creek, Abbey Dawn Creek, Abbey Lake, Abbie Lake, Abbotsford Creek, Abbotsford Lake, Abbott Creek, Abbott Lake, Abe Creek, Abelson Lake, Aberarder Creek, Aber Creek, Aberdeen Creek, Aberdeen Lake, Aberfoyle Creek, Aber Lake, Abernethy Lake,

Abes Lake, Abie Lake, Abigogami Creek, Abigogami Lake, Abimatinu Lake, Abimatinu River, Abinette Lake, Abinette River, Abitibi River, Abitibi Lake, Abney Lake, Abram Lake, Abs Lake, Acanthus Lake, Ace Lake, Acer Lake, Achapi Lake, Acheson Lake, Achigan Creek, Achigan Lake, Acid Lake, Acker Lake, Ackert Drain, Acme Lake, Acolyte Lake, Aconda Lake, Acorn Lake, Acre Lake, Acton Lake, Acton Pond, Adagio Lake, Adair Creek, Adair Lake, Ada Lake, Adamac Lake, Adam Creek, Adamhay Lake, Adam Lake, Adam's Bay, Adams Creek, Adams Lake, Adamson Lake, Adams Pond, Adams River, Adams River Bay, Adanac Lake, Adanac Creek, Addie Lake, Addington Lake, Addison Lake, Add Lake, Adelaide Creek, Adelaide Lake, Adelard Lake, Adele Lake, Adel Lake, Adik Creek, Adik Lake, Adios Lake, Admiral Creek, Admiral Lake, Admit Lake, Adobe Lake, Adogio Lake, Adrains Creek, Adrian Lake, Adrienne Lake, Adventure Creek, Adventure Lake, Adze Lake, Aegean Creek, Aegean Lake, Aerial Lake, Aerobus Bay, Aerobus Creek, Aerobus Lake, Aerofoil Lake, Aeroplane Lake, Affleck Lake, A-Frame Lake, Again River, Agam Lake, Agar Lake, Agassiz Lake, Agate Creek, Agate Lake, Agawa Bay, Agawa Lake, Agawa River, Agawask Creek, Agimak Lake, Agnes Lake, Agnes River, Agnew Lake, Agonzon Lake, Agreen Lake, Aguasabon River, Aguasabon Lake, Ague Lake, Agusada Creek, Agusada Lake, Agusk Lake, Agutua Lake, Agutua River, Agwa Bay, Agwasuk River, Agwatik River, Ahdik Lake, Ahern Lake, Ahmabel Lake, Ahme Lake, Ahme Creek, Ahmic Creek, Ahmic Lake, Ahsin Bay, Ahsine Creek, Ahsine Lake, Aide Creek, Aide Lake, Aidie Creek, Aikens Lake, Aikman Lake, Aileen Lake, Ainslie Lake, Air Base Bay, Aird Bay, Aird Lake, Airfield Creek, Air Hole Lake, Airplane Lake, Airport Drain, Airport Lake, Airstrip Lake, Airy Creek, Airy Lake, Aitken Creek, Aitken Lake, Ajax Lake, Akandamo Lakes, Akandamo River, Akebia Creek, Akebia Lake, Akey Lake, Aki Lake, Akin Lakes, Akonesi Creek, Akonesi Lake, Akonewi Lake, Akow Lake, Akron Creek, Akron Lake, Alabama Lake, A Lake, Alaska's Lake, Alba Lake, Albany River, Cox Bay, Cox Creek, Cox Lake, Cox's Lake, Coy Lake, Coyle Creek, Coyle Lake, Coyne Lake, Coyston Lake, CPR Bay, Crabclaw Creek, Crabclaw Lake, Crab Lake, Crabtree Lake, Cracknell Lake, Crackshot Lake, Craddock Creek, Craddock Lake, Cradle Creek, Cradle Lake, Craft Creek, Craft Lake, Crag Lake, Craig Lake, Caignative Lake, Craigs Creek, Craig's Swamp, Crain Lake, Crains Lake, Cramadog Creek, Cramadog Lake, Cramp Creek, Cramp Lake, Cranberry Bay, Cranberry Creek, Cranberry Lake, Chenier Lake, Cherie Creek, Cherniuk Lake, Cherries Bay, Cherrington Lake, Cherry Creek, Cherry Lake, Cherry River, Chesakan Creek, Chesakan Lake, Chesley Lake, Chesney Bay, Chesterfield Bay, Chesterfield Creek, Chesterfield Lake, Chester Lake, Chewink Creek, Chewink Lake, Chiah Lake, Chiblow Lake, Chicago Bay, Chicault Lake, Chickadee Lake, Chicken Farm Lake, Chicken Liver Channel, Chick Lake, Chicobi Lake, Chicot Lake, Chief Bay, Chief Creek, Chief Lake, Chief Peter Lake, Chief's Creek, Chiki Lake, Chilcott Lake, Childerhorse Creek, Childerhorse Lake, Chill Creek, Chill

Lake, Chilton Lake, Chimahagan River, Chime Lake, China Lake, Chin Creek, Chiniguchi River, Chiniguchi Lake, Chin Lake, Chin River, Chipai River, Chipai Lake, Chipchase Lake, Chipican Lake, Chip Lake, Chipman Lake, Chipmunk Creek, Chipmunk Lake, Chippawa Channel, Chippago Lake, Chippewa Creek, Chippy Lake, Chisamore Lake, Chisholm Drain, Chit Lake, Fade Lake, Fagan Lake, Fagan Ponds, Fagus Bay, Fahey Lake, Fairbairn Creek, Fairbairn Lake, Fairbanks Creek, Fairchild Creek, Fairchild Lake, Faircloth Lake, Fairholme Lake, Fair Lake, Fairloch Lake, Fairplay Lake, Fairs Creek, Fairview Creek, Fairy Creek, Fairy Lake, Faith Lake, Fakeloo Lake, Fakeloo Creek, Falan Lake, Falby Lake, Falcon Lake, Fall Creek, Fallduck Lakes, Fallen Creek, Fallen Lake, Fall-In-Lake, Fallis Pond, Fall Lake, Fallon Island, Falloon Lake, Fall River, Fallscamp Creek, Fallscamp Lake, Falls Lake, Falls River, False Creek, False Lake, Falsetto Lake, Fan Lake, Fanny Lake, Fanshawe Lake, Fansher Lake, Faraday Creek, Faraday Lake, Farah Lake, Farden Lake, Farewell Bay, Farewell Lake, Faries Lake, Faris Lake, Farlain Lake, Far Lake, Farlane Lake, Farlette Lake, Farley Lake, Farleys Creek, Farlinger Lake, Farm Bay, Farm Bay Lake, Farm Creek, Farmer Lake, Farm Lake, Farncomb Lake, Farncomb Creek, Farner Lake, Farnes Lake, Farnham Creek, Farquhar Creek, Farquhar Lake, Farr Creek, Farrel Creek, Farrel Lake, Farrell Lake, Farrer Lake, Farrington Lake, Farrington Creek, Farrow Lake, Farwell Creek, Fassett Lake, Fatima Lake, Fat Lake, Fat River, Fatty Creek, Fatty Lake, Faubert Lake, Faulkenham Lake, Faulk Lake, Faulkner Lake, Fault Creek, Fault Lake, Faultside Lake, Fauquier Lake, Favel Bay, Favel Lake, Favell Bay, Favot Creek, Favot Creek, Fawcett Lake, Fawn Creek, Fawn Lake, Fawthrop Lake, Faya Lake, Feagan Lake, Fear Lake, Fearless Lake, Feather Lake, Feather River, Feaver Lake, Fecteau Lake, Fee Lake, Feely Creek, Feely Lake, Feeny Lake, Feeny Lake, Feist Creek, Feist Lake, Felcite Lake, Feldman Lake, Feline Lake, Felix Lake, Fells Bay, Felsen Creek, Felsen Lake, Felst Lake, Felt Lake, Felto Lake, Fenelon River, Fen Lake, Fennah Lake, Fennell Lake, Fenn Lake, Fenson Lake, Fenton Lake, Fergus Lake, Fergus Creek, Ferguson Lake, Ferguson Bay, Ferguson Creek, Ferguson Drain, Fergusons Lake, Ferland's Lake, Fermoy Lake, Fern Creek, Ferndale Bay, Fern Lake, Fernley Drain, Fernlund Lake, Fernow Lake, Fernow River, Ferns Lake, Ferrier Creek, Ferrie River, Ferrim Lake, Ferris Lake, Festuca Lake, Fetter Lake, Fewster Drain, Fib Lake, Ficht Lake, Fiddler Lake, Fidler River, Fido Lake, Field's Lake, Fife Lake, Fifteen Lake, Fifteen Mile Creek, Fifteen Mile Lake, Fifteen Mile Pond, Fifth Lake, Fifty Creek, Fifty Dollar Lake, Fifty Nine Lake, Fifty Two Lake, Fillet Creek, Fillet Lake, Fillion Lake, Fills Lake, Film Lake, Filter Creek, Filter Lake, Final Lake, Fin Bay, Finch Lake, Fin Creek, Findlay Creek, Findlay Creek, Findlay Lake, Fine Lake, Finger Bay, Finger Lake, Finish Lake, Fink Lake, Fin Lake, Finland Creek, Finlay Bay, Finlay Creek, Finlayson Creek, Finlayson Lake, Finnegan Lake, Finney Creek, Finney Lake, Finn Lake, Finton Lake, Fintry Creek, Fire Creek, Firefly Creek, Firefly Lake, Fire Hill Creek, Fire Hill Lake, Fire

Lake, Fireline Lake, Firella Creek, Fire River, Firesand River, Firesteel River, Firetail Creek, Firetail Lake, Fir Lake, Firman's Creek, First Concession Drain, First Creek, First Depot Lake, First Egan Lake, First Government Lake, First James Lake, First Justin Lake, First Kargus Lake, First Lake, First Loon Creek, First Loon Lake, Firth Creek, Firth Lake, Fischer Lake, Fishbasket Lake.

Loi réclamant la ministre de l'Environnement de libérer ses responsabilités sous l'article 15(1) de la Loi sur les ressources en eau de l'Ontario afin de déterminer le contenu des moules zébrées du :

Cana Lake, Canal Bay, Canal Lake, Canard Lake, Canard River, Canary Lake, Cancer Lake, Candide Creek, Candide Lake, Candler Lake—

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that we dispense with the reading of this bill? No, we do not have unanimous consent. Please proceed, Mr Clerk.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: —Candybar Creek, Candybar Lake, Candy Creek, Cane Lake, Canisbay Creek, Canisbay Lake, Canis Lake, Canister Creek, Canister Lake, Can Lake, Canna Creek, Canna Lake, Cannard's Bay, Canniff Creek, Canniff Lake, Canning Lake, Cannings Falls, Cannon Creek, Cannon Lake, Canoe Bay, Canoe Bay Channel, Canoe Channel, Canoe Creek, Canoe Lake, Canoeshed Lake, Canon Creek, Canon Lake, Canonto Lake, Can Opener Lake, Canterbury Lake, Canthook Lake, Cantin Lake, Cantley Creek, Cantley Lake, Canton Lake, Cantrill Lake, Cauty Lake, Canvasback Lake, Canyon Creek, Canyon Falls, Canyon Lake, Canyon River, Cap Creek, Cape Lake, Cape Harbour, Cape Hurd Channel, Capella Lake, Capin Lake, Cap Lake, Capper Lake, Capre Lake, Capreol Lake, Capricornus Lake, Capsell Lake, Captain Lake, Captains Lake, Captain Tom Lake, Capton Lake, Caput Lake, Carafel Creek, Carafel Lake, Caragana Lake, Caramat Creek, Caramat Lake, Carcajou Bay, Carcajou Creek, Carcajou Lake, Carcass Lake, Card Bay, Carder Lake, Cardiff Creek, Cardiff Lake, Cardinal Creek, Cardinalis Lake, Cardinal Lake, Card Lake, Cards Lake, Cardwell Lake, Carew Lake, Carey Creek, Carey Lake, Carfrae Lake, Cargill Lake, Cargill Mill Pond, Carhess Creek, Cariad Lake, Carib Creek, Carib Lake, Cariboo Creek, Cariboo Lake, Caribou Bay, Caribou Creek, Caribou Lake, Caribou Rapids, Caribou River, Caribou Throat Lake, Caribus Lake, Carillon Rapids, Carkner Lake, Car Lake, Carl Bay, Carlbom Lake, Carl Creek, Carleton Lake, Carling Bay, Carling Lake, Carl Lake, Carlo Lake, Carlson Lake, Carlstead Bay, Carlton Lake, Carlyle Lake, Carman Bay, Carman Creek, Carman Lake, Carmichael Lake, Carnachan Bay, Carnahan Lake, Carney Creek, Carney Lake, Carnilac Lake, Caro Lake, Caroline Lake, Carol Lake, Carolyn Creek, Caron Creek, Caron Lake, Carpenter Lake, Carpenter River, Carpet Lake, Carp Lake, Carp River, Carre Lake, Carrick Creek, Carrick Lake, Carrie Lake, Carriere Lake, Carrigan Lake, Carrington Lake, Carroll Creek, Carroll Lake, Carroll Wood Bay, Carrot Lake, Carruthers Lake, Carrying Lake, Carry Lake, Carscallen Lake, Carson Bay, Carson Creek, Carson Lake, Carss Creek, Carstens Lake, Carswell Lake, Cartan Lake, Carter Bay, Carter Lake, Carter Rapids, Carthew

Bay, Cartier Lake, Cartier Creek, Cart Lake, Cartwrights Creek, Carty Creek, Carty Lake, Carver Lake, Cascade Falls, Cascade Lake, Cascaden Lake, Cascade Rapids, Cascade River, Cascanette Lake, Case River, Casey Creek, Casey Lake, Casgrain Creek, Casgrain Lake, Cash Creek, Cashel Lake, Cashman Creek, Cashore Creek, Casino Lake, Caskie Bay, Caskill Lake, Cask Lake, Casper Lake, Casque Lake, Cassdaga Lake, Casselman's Lake, Casselman's Creek, Cassels Lake, Cassidy Bay, Cassidy Creek, Cassidy Lake, Cassidys Bay, Cass Lake, Casson Lake, Castellar Creek, Castellar Lake, Castlebar Creek, Castlebar Lake, Castle Bay, Castle Creek, Castle Lake, Castleman Lake, Castlewood Creek, Castlewood Lake, Castor Creek, Castor Lake, Castoroil Lake, Castor Ponds, Castor River, Castra Lake, Casummit Lake, Caswell Bay, Caswell Lake, Cataract Falls, Cataract Lake, Catarauqui Bay, Catarauqui River, Catastrophe Creek, Catastrophe Lake, Catawba Lake, Cat Bay, Catchacoma Lake, Catcher Lake, Cat Creek, Caterpillar Lake, Cat Falls, Catfish Bay, Catfish Creek, Catfish Lake, Catfish Rapids, Catharine Lake, Cathro Lake, Cathy's Lake, Catlonite Creek, Catlonite Lake, Cat River, Cat Tail River, Cattral Lake, Cauchon Creek, Cauchon Lake, Caulfield Lake, Cauley Lake, Cauliflower Creek, Cauliflower Lake, Caulkin Lake, Caution Lake, Cavalary Creek, Cavalary Lake, Cavanagh Lake, Cavan Creek, Cavano Lake, Cave Harbour, Cave Lake, Cavell Creek, Cavell Lake, Cavendish Lake, Caverly's Bay, Cavern Creek, Cavern Lake, Cavers Bay, Cavers Creek, Cavers Lake, Caviar Lake, Cawanogami Lake, Cawdron Creek, Cawdron Lake, Cawing Lake, Cawston Lakes, Cawston Lakes, Cawthra Creek, Caya's Lake, Cayer Creek, Cayer Lake, Cayiens Creek, Caysee Lake, Cayuga Creek, Cayuga Lake, Cebush Lake, Cecebe Lake, Cecil Creek, Cecile Lake, Cedar Bay, Cedarbough Lake, Cedarclump Lake, Cedar Creek, Cedar Falls, Cedargum Lake, Cedar Harbour, Cedar Lake, Cedar Rapids, Cedar River, Cedarskirt Lake, Cedric Lake, Cee Creek, Ceepee Lake, Celastruc Lake, Cellist Lake, Celt Creek, Celtis Lake, Celt Lake, Cemetery Creek, Cemetery Lake, Centennial Lake, Centralis Creek, Centralis Lake, Central Lake, Centre Channel, Centre Creek, Centre Falls, Centrefire Creek, Centrefire Lake, Centre Lake, Centreville Creek, Ceph Lake, Ceres Lake, Cerulean Lake, Cerullo Lake, Chabbie Lake, Chabbie River, Chabot Lake, Chadwick Lake, Chagma Lake, Chagnon Lake, Chaillon Lake, Chain Creek, Chain Lake, Chain Lakes, The Chain of Lakes, Chainy Creek, Chainy Lake, Chair Lake, Chalet Creek, Chalet Lake, Chalice Lake, Chalk Bay, Chalk Creek, Chalkend Lake, Chalk Lake, Chalk River, Challenger Lake, Challenger River, Challis Lake, Chalmers Lake, Chamandy Lake, Chamberlain Lake, Chamber Lake, Chambers Lake, Champagne Lake, Champlain Creek, Champlain Trail Lakes, Chance Lake, Chancellor Lake, Chandos Lake, Change Lake, Chanley Lake, Channel Lake, Channel Lakes, Green River, Greenrod Lake, Greens Bay, Green's Creek, Greenshields Lake, Greenshore Lake, Greensides Lake, Greens Lake, Greenstone Rapids, Greensward Lake, Green Tree Lake, Greenwater Creek, Greenwater Lake, Greenwich Creek, Greenwich Lake, Greenwood Lake, Greenwood River,

Greer Creek, Greer Lake, Greers Bay, Greggio Lake, Greggs Lake, Gregory Bay, Gregory Creek, Gregory Lake, Grehan Lake, Greig Lake, Gremm Lake, Grenadier Creek, Grenadier Lake, Grenadier Pond, Grenfell Lake, Grenier Lake, Grenville Lake, Greske Lake, Greta Lake, Gretchel Creek, Gretchel Lake, Gretel Creek, Gretel Lake, Grew Lake, Grew River, Grey Duck Lake, Grey Lake, Grelava Lake, Grey Owl Bay, Grey Owl Lake, Green Creek, Greengrass Lake, Greenheart Creek, Greenheart Lake, Greenhedge Lake, Greenhill Lake, Greenhill Rapids, Greenhill River, Greenhorn Bay, Greenhue Lake, Greening Lake, Greening's Bay, Greenish Creek, Greenish Lake, Green Island Bay, Green Island Lake, Green Lake, Green Lakes, Greenland Lake, Greenlaw Lake, Greenleaf Creek, Greenleaf Lake, Greenlee Lake, Greenmantle Lake, Greenmantle River, Greenock Creek, Greenock Lake, Greenough Harbour, Greenpike Lake, Gravel Lake, Gravel Lakes, Gravelly Bay, Gravelpit Lake, Gravel Pit Pond, Gravelridge Lake, Gravel River, Gravenor Lake, Graves Lake, Graveyard Creek, Graveyard Lake, Graveyard Rapids, Gravy Lake, Grawbarger Lake, Grawbarger's Rapids, Graydarl Lake, Graydon Lake, Gray Lake, Grayling Lake, Graymud Lake, Gray Rapids, Grays Bay, Grays Creek, Grays Lake, Grayson Lake, Grayson River, Grays River, Graystone Lake, Graytrout Lake, Grazing Lake, Grazing River, Great Lake, Great Mountain Lake, Great North Bay, Great Portage Lake, Great South Bay, Grebe Lake, Greb Lake, Green Bay, Greenbough Lake, Green Bug Lake, Greenbush Lake, Green Creek, Grants Lake, Granzies Lake, Grape Lake, Graphic Creek, Graphic Lake, Graphite Lake, Grapnel Bay, Grapnel Creek, Grapnel Lake, Grasett Lake, Grass Creek, Grasser Lake, Grass Hill Lake, Grass Lake, Grassy Bay, Grassy Creek, Grassy Lake, Grassy Portage Bay, Grassy River, Gratton Creek, Gratton Lake, Grave Bay, Grave Creek, Grave Lake, Gravel Bay, Gravel Beach Lake, Gravel Falls, Graham Bay, Graham Creek, Graham Lake, Grahams Creek, Graham's Lake, Granary Creek, Granary Lake, Grand Bay, Grand Campment Bay,

Grande Lake, Grandeur Lake, Grand Lake, Grandmaison Lake, Grandma Lake, Grandma Stevens Pond, Grandolph Bay, Grandpa Lake, Grandpop's Lake, Grand Rapids, Grand River, Grandview Lake, Granite Bay, Graniteboss Lake, Granite Creek, Granite Falls, Granitehill Lake, Granite Lake, Granite River—

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that we dispense with the completion of the reading of this bill?

An hon member: No.

The Acting Speaker: I hear a negative.

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: —Granitic Lake, Granka Lake, Granny Bay, Granny's Creek, Grano Lake, Grant Bay, Grant Creek, Grant Lake, Grant Point Harbour, Grants Creek, Grants Creek Bay, Gosselin Creek, Gosselin Lake, Gosselin's Bay, Goss Lake, Goudreau Creek, Goudreau Lake, Goudy Creek, Goudy Lake, Gough Creek, Gough Lake, Gouinlock Lake, Gouin Lake, Goulais Bay, Goulais Lake, Goulais River, Gould Creek, Goulding Lake, Goulet Bay, Goulet Creek, Goulet Lake, Gourd Lake, Gourlay Lake, Gourlie Creek, Govan Lake, Gove Lake, Gover Lake, Government Bay, Government Creek, Government Lake, Governor Bay, Gowan Creek, Gowan Lake, Gowar Bay, Goward Lake, Gowganda Bay, Gowganda Lake, Gowie Bay, Grabers Lake, Grab Lake, Grace Bay, Grace Creek, Graceful Lake, Grace Lake, Gracie Lake, Grady Lake, Graff Lake, Goose Lake, Goose Neck Bay, Gooseneck Creek—

The Acting Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that we dispense reading? Do we have unanimous consent?

Agreed to.

The Acting Speaker: The motion is for first reading of the bill. All those in favour?

Motion agreed to.

La motion est adoptée.

The House adjourned at 1802.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	Minister of Education
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	Chair, standing committee on social development
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
			Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	House leader
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	House leader
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
			Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Wininger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White
 Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow
 Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson
 Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland
 Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman
 Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen
 Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
 Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini
 Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown
 Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
 Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman
 Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean
 Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaitre, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan
 Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon
 Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
 Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow
 Vice-Chair: Drummond White
 Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan
 Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole
 Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
 Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland
 Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor
 Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Micalash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
 Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos
 Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters
 Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
 Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan
 Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano
 Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
 Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
 Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson
 Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
 Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner
 Co-Chair: Noel Duignan
 Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
 Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Monday 6 May 1991

Members' statements

Education program evaluation	1169
Mr Beer	
Oath of allegiance	1169
Mr Jackson	
Workweek	1169
Ms S. Murdock	
Hazardous waste	1169
Mrs Sullivan	
Highway safety	1170
Mr Arnott	
Apprenticeship training	1170
Mr Mammoliti	
Severance payment and termination hearings	1170
Mr Cleary	
Development deposits	1171
Mr Perruzza	

Statements by the ministry

OMA agreement	1172
Ms Lankin	
Arts and culture funding	1174
Mr Marchese	

Responses

OMA agreement	1175
Mr Phillips	
Arts and culture funding	1175
Mr Henderson	
OMA agreement	1175
Mrs Witmer	
Arts and culture funding	1176
Mrs Marland	

Oral questions

Assistance to business	1176
Mr Kwinter	
Mr Pilkey	
Hunting and fishing in Algonquin Park	1177
Mr Scott	
Mr Wildman	
Taxation	1178
Mr Stockwell	
Mr Laughren	
Budget	1179
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
OMA agreement	1180
Mr Phillips	

Ms Lankin

Non-profit housing	1181
Mr Tilson	
Mr Cooke	
Hunting and fishing in Algonquin Park	1181
Mr Drainville	
Mr Wildman	
Taxation	1182
Mr Conway	
Mr Laughren	
Mr Cousens	
Cost of electrical power	1183
Mrs Mathyssen	
Ms Carter	
Long-term care	1183
Mrs McLeod	
Ms Akande	
Ministerial accountability	1184
Mr Harris	
Ms Akande	

First reading

Zebra Mussels Act, Bill 95	1186
Mr Harris	
Agreed to	1199

Other business

Order of business	1170
Mr Sterling	
Visitor	1171
The Speaker	
Order of business	1171
Mr Sterling	
Mr Cooke	
School transfer	1172
The Speaker	
Order of business	1172
Mr Sterling	
Written questions	1184
Mr Cousens	
Mr J. Wilson	
Mrs Marland	
Mr Cooke	
Mr Turnbull	
Adjournment	1199

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1200
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1203

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Le lundi 6 mai 1991

Déclaration ministérielle

Subventions pour les arts et la culture 1174
M. Marchese

Première lecture

Loi enquêtant les moules zébrées projet de loi 95 . . . 1186
M. Harris
Adoptée 1199

29 1991



29 1991

ISSN 1180-2987

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 7 May 1991

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 7 mai 1991



Speaker
Honourable David Warner

Clerk
Claude L. DesRosiers

Président
L'honorable David Warner

Greffier
Claude L. DesRosiers



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with an alphabetical list of members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 325-7400.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1 (800) 668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste alphabétique de députés de l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 325-7400.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1 (800) 668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday 7 May 1991

The House met at 1330.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon Ms Lankin: I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

The Speaker: The Lieutenant Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending 31 March 1992, and recommends them to the Legislative Assembly.

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

PARLIAMENTARY PROCESS

Mr Daigeler: For the last three days the Conservative Party has amply demonstrated why politicians are held in such low esteem across the country. Desperate for public attention, they have hijacked the House with adolescent antics of introducing obscure bills and forcing the Speaker to read long lists of Ontario locations.

I do not like the Treasurer's budget any more than the Tories do. However, I accept that on 6 September the people of Ontario gave the NDP a democratic mandate to govern. Wasting the taxpayers' money by frustrating the parliamentary process for days on end is an abuse of democracy, whether it is done by the member for Welland-Thorold or the leader of the third party.

The NDP government is steering us daily deeper into a suffocating morass of fiscal irresponsibility. The country is in the midst of its greatest crisis since Confederation. Faced with problems of such magnitude, what does the Conservative Party leader do? He reads into Hansard an hour-long list of Ontario lakes and rivers.

Such obstructionist buffoonery is shameful. It is unworthy of the dignity and importance of parliamentary government. The public has long lost patience with mindless partisanship in the face of urgent policy problems.

The people of Ontario recognize the Tory plot for what it is: a clumsy attempt by the third-party leader to raise his own profile. I can assure members the people of my riding and elsewhere do not take kindly to such a flagrant perversion of our parliamentary rules.

EDUCATION WEEK

Mrs Cunningham: This week is Education Week in Ontario. Students, parents, teachers and communities are celebrating across the province in many different ways. For example, the London and Middlesex County Roman Catholic Separate School Board has a full week-long agenda. Students will take part in a folk dance festival, technological displays, writers' day workshops, Science Olympics and many athletic activities.

The London Board of Education has an interesting program this year. Instead of developing an actual agenda of events, students are inviting their parents and their neighbours to join them in the classroom. It is an opportunity for

everyone to see first hand the quality of programs their children are involved in.

As students in London are celebrating this week with community and classroom events, students in Essex county are taking a different approach. In light of last week's events where a public school was transferred, students are demonstrating their commitment to the quality of their education by not attending classes and holding rallies.

It is unfortunate that these students are forced to participate in this fashion. Because of a transfer process that is confusing and without government leadership, Essex students are demonstrating in their own way that their education and schools are very important to them. It is about time that we took a look at that process. It simply is not working in Ontario.

HALIBURTON SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS

Mr Drainville: This year over 2,000 people from across the province, the United States and around the world will gather in Haliburton to partake in over 150 short courses offered at Ontario's largest summer school of fine arts. The school runs from 1 July to 2 August in the village of Haliburton.

It is important to realize that the Haliburton School of Fine Arts looks at education from a holistic perspective. The focus of the school is on the arts. To that end, Sir Sandford Fleming College, which operates the school, provides students with internationally recognized experts as teachers. This year the instructors include silversmith Lois Ethrington-Betteridge and Bronfman Award winner Susan Warner-Keane. But summertime is summertime, so students also take classes in wind surfing, calligraphy and music.

This school provides numerous benefits to both students and the community. The students are receiving a first-class education in the arts. The community receives many economic and cultural benefits which most rural communities can only dream of.

It is my hope that we can diversify the economies of rural communities through programs such as the Haliburton School of Fine Arts so that people in all corners of Ontario can enjoy these cultural and economic benefits.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE

Mr Chiarelli: On the question of new automobile insurance legislation, I ask the NDP government to show respect for this Legislature and for the people of Ontario.

On 30 March the Treasurer commented on new automobile insurance legislation by saying: "We want very much to get it introduced this spring. I think we are going to be scrambling." Time is short to introduce this legislation before summer, and yet within the last several weeks the minister responsible has been saying all options are still being considered.

This non-imperative but major legislation is being unduly rushed through. Millions of dollars are being spent on

consultants' reports which the government refuses to make available to the opposition or to the public. Surely the government will not expect this new legislation to be rubber-stamped at second reading with a few hours of debate in June—certainly not when the government refuses to share its technical papers, refuses to provide a draft bill in advance and continues to scramble with the drafting of a major bill.

The government is being given fair warning: Show respect for the opposition's right to information and study; show respect for the people of Ontario, who have the major stake in this very important issue.

1340

NURSES APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr Eves: This week is Nurses Appreciation Week, and I would like to take this opportunity to salute the 80,000 nurses across this province who have dedicated their lives to the health care system and the wellbeing of others.

Nurses remain at the heart and soul of our health care system. From Ontario hospitals to nursing homes, homes for the aged, public health units, Victorian Order of Nurses units and within industrial facilities, we all depend on nurses.

I am extremely pleased that the recent contract negotiations between the government and the Ontario Nurses' Association have led to an agreement which will recognize and reward nurses. However, there are many more areas where we can make improvements. Nursing responsibilities are growing with the recognition that they are capable of taking on added responsibilities and tackling the challenges that surround the growing advancements in medicine and technology today. Nurses continue to remain under pressure to update their education and yet cope with stressful working conditions that accompany shift work and some very high-stress critical care work indeed.

This week we are given the opportunity to show our appreciation to nurses across the province and I would urge all members of the Legislature to join with me in congratulating nurses for a job well done.

SAULT STE MARIE GREYHOUNDS

Mr Martin: Today I congratulate the Sault Ste Marie Greyhounds and hold up to the members their story as a hockey team, a hockey team that has suffered rejection and near-abandonment, a preamble to a brilliant success story.

The Soo Greyhounds epitomize everything good in Sault Ste Marie and indeed in northern Ontario. The Greyhounds have overcome difficult obstacles, but, with the support and courage of the community and team players, they have proven to be winners in our hearts and in this province. They are a definite reflection of a first-class city with a hardworking attitude, the type of team that, regardless of the hardships, continues to battle no matter what the future holds.

The Soo Greyhounds have given back to Sault Ste Marie some of the confidence, the pride and the determination we have lacked recently. The Greyhounds committed themselves to the community and helped to ease our pain through troubled times. Regardless of the eventual

outcomes, the Soo Greyhounds will remain victorious, a saving grace in an unfortunate period.

I particularly would like to acknowledge the players George Shunock and Ted Nolan. These people have invested their time and energy, hopes and dreams so that we may experience what they did last night, a win over Oshawa.

Congratulations to the Soo Greyhounds and to the community, and best of luck in the games to come.

OAK RIDGES MORaine

Mr Beer: Today I ask the Minister of the Environment to take action to respond to the clear wishes of the council of King township and the township's residents to halt the proposed development by Ascot Estates on the headwaters of the Kettleby Creek, which lies in the Oak Ridges moraine.

I hardly need to tell the minister how important it is to protect this watershed or how critical its preservation is to the greater Toronto area. The minister has received many letters on this issue from the mayor and council and residents of the township, as well as, most recently, a letter dated 2 May from Margaret Coburn, the chairperson of the Concerned Citizens of King Township.

The minister will also be aware of the strong and passionate appeal made by Toronto Star columnist Michele Landsberg to stop this proposed development.

In Margaret Coburn's letter she notes that two different councils since 1985 have voted unanimously against the Ascot proposal.

Last September, a decision was handed down by the Ontario Municipal Board overturning the clear voice of the township. As Michele Landsberg states, "The municipal board's decision was a travesty." In her view, the transcript of the board's hearings, which was made at the expense of the township, displayed "enough bias and ignorance to make your hair stand on end."

Simply put, the minister has said she will act to protect the Oak Ridges moraine. The proposed Ascot development is a good place to show she means what she says. The democratically elected King township council has said no to this development. They need her help and her direct intervention. Now the decision is up to her and she has a responsibility to act.

LEV LUKIANENKO

Mr Jackson: The winds of political change that have swept over eastern Europe have for ever blown away one-party totalitarianism, which dominated the national scene of so many countries of the now crumbling Soviet empire.

Lev Lukianenko, a leading political figure in Ukraine, is a prominent participant in that continuing process of national liberation and self-determination. Born in eastern Ukraine, Mr Lukianenko became a lawyer at the Moscow faculty of law and started his legal career in L'vov. In 1961, he was arrested for drafting the constitution of the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union, which advocated secession of Ukraine from the Soviet Union in conformity with article 17 of the Soviet constitution. His death sentence was commuted to 15 years' hard labour and imprisonment.

Upon his release, he was forbidden to practise law and took employment as an electrician. In 1976, he became a founding member of the Helsinki Group for the Defence of Human Rights and its chief legal adviser. He was arrested again in 1977 for his writings and sentenced to 10 years of forced labour with an additional five years in exile. He was released in 1988. He returned to Ukraine and became head of its Republican Party. He was elected last year to the Parliament of Ukraine as the member for the city of L'vov. During the March 1991 referendum, he actively campaigned in support of the independence clause of the referendum question. Today, Lukianenko, the political prisoner, is a candidate for the presidency of a free future Ukraine.

It is my distinct privilege to welcome Lev Lukianenko, who has honoured us by his presence in this House today and is sitting in the Speaker's gallery.

[Remarks in Ukrainian]

QUEEN'S VENTURER AWARDS

Mr Malkowski: I am very proud to rise in the House today and tell members about a special awards ceremony that took place last Saturday. The Lieutenant Governor, the Honourable Lincoln Alexander, presented the Queen's Venturer Award to several members of the Scouts and Guides. This award recognizes that the Venturer is known as an individual with both character and skills to be of significant help to other people.

I am especially proud to have the opportunity to congratulate three outstanding young people who live in my riding of York East. They are Alexander Forrest, David Harker and Kathleen Jarvis.

I would like to add that in addition to receiving the Queen's award, my constituent Kathleen Jarvis acted as the valedictorian at the ceremony. She will also represent Canada in Washington DC on 16 May at a conference where she will talk about her achievements.

I am pleased when those honoured for hard work and community involvement live in the constituency that I represent. I am sure all members share the special pride that I take in recognizing the young people who set such high standards for us to follow.

VISITORS

The Speaker: Following along on the very kind comments by the member for Burlington South, I would like to ask all members of the assembly to recognize in the Speaker's gallery today Roman Lubrinsky, people's deputy of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and member of the standing committee on foreign affairs. He is ably joined by a former member of the assembly, the former member for High Park-Swansea, Yuri Shymko.

Mr Ruprecht: Mr Speaker, on a point of order which is non-controversial: When important dignitaries arrive from other countries, you may wish to consider having the members properly informed so that appropriate comments can be made from all sides and from all political parties. I wish you would take that into consideration the next time we hear from the great Ukrainian community or from

Ukraine, such as those who have arrived here today to create friendship between the Ukraine and Canada.

The Speaker: I am extremely sensitive to your suggestion and indeed I will do my best to ensure that we have an appropriate opportunity for all members to welcome our visitors.

1350

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Mrs Cunningham: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d): On 22 November 1990 I tabled Orders and Notices questions. The one I want to talk to you about today is number 309, which reads as follows:

"Would the Minister of Skills Development provide a list of consultants' reports commissioned by the ministry in fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90." I will reiterate that the date was 22 November 1990.

I am serious on this one. Standing order 95(d) states, "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

Orders and Notices questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost six months since we tabled this question. An interim answer was tabled on 13 December 1990, but that answer predicted that the information would be available on 21 February 1991.

It has now been almost four months since the date the information was to be made available. The failure to answer Orders and Notices paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof."

As a member of the assembly, I feel I have a right of access to information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering the question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: The member for London North will be pleased to know that she has a valid point of order. No doubt her concerns have been listened to by the minister affected and one would expect a response in relatively short order.

I would mention to members that it is normally the practice to raise these types of concerns at the end of question period; however, it is certainly within your rights to raise them at other moments, as you have done.

Mr Carr: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I think it is urgent that we should address this at this time.

Under order 95(d), on 22 November I tabled an Orders and Notices paper question numbered 100, which read as follows:

"Would the Minister of Corrections list the three travel agencies with which the ministry placed the greatest portion of its travel business for the fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89, 1989-90 and the year-to-date for 1990."

Standing order 95 states that the minister shall answer all questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly, time consuming or because the minister declines to answer. A notification shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper.

The date of this information is 22 November, and the failure to answer the Orders and Notices paper question is a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof."

As a member of the assembly, I feel I have a right of access to the information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario and make sure they are complied with.

The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering these questions. I ask that you take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: The member for Oakville South will be pleased to know that he has indeed a valid point of order, and no doubt the minister affected has heard his concerns and he should anticipate a response.

Mr Runciman: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I hate to spoil your day, but I have another point of order. I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d). On 22 November, I tabled an order paper question which reads as follows. It is an inquiry to the minister.

"Would the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations state the current status of each consultant's report commissioned by the ministry in fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90."

Standing order 95(d) states: "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

Order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost six months since I tabled this question. An interim answer was provided, but that answer predicted that information would be available on 22 February. It has now been several months since the date the information was to be made available.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege

occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof."

As a member of this assembly, I feel I have a right of access to the information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for standing orders by not answering this question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: The member for Leeds-Grenville too will be pleased to know that he has indeed a valid point of order. I am sure the minister to whom his concerns are addressed has heard his remarks and he should anticipate a response.

Mrs Marland: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: Under standing order 95(d)—

Interjections.

Mrs Marland: Maybe the government members are not interested.

Interjections.

The Speaker: As with each and every point of order that is raised at any time in the assembly, the Speaker must be able to hear the point of order that is being raised in order to determine whether or not it is a valid point. I would like that opportunity.

Mrs Marland: After being in this House eight months, the members do not know the standing orders.

I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d). On 22 November 1990 I tabled order paper question number 117, which reads as follows; it is an inquiry to the ministry.

"Would the Minister of Culture and Communications list the cost of all ministry publications, with details on how each was published and how contracts were awarded, including the cost of translation."

Standing order 95(d) states, "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

1400

Mr Speaker, order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost five months since I tabled this question. An interim answer was provided on 11 December 1990, but that answer predicted that the information would be available on 26 April 1991. It has now been approximately two weeks since the date the information was to be made available.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege

occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof." As a member of this assembly, I feel that I have a right to the access of information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering this question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario in order that the people of this province can know how much publications like this are costing the taxpayers at a time of recession.

The Speaker: You have a valid point of order. No doubt the minister to whom your concerns are directed has heard your concerns and you should expect a response.

Mrs Witmer: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—
Interjections.

The Speaker: While I sense a certain restlessness, it certainly would be appreciated if the member for Waterloo North would have an opportunity to place what she believes is her point of order.

Mrs Witmer: On 22 November 1990 I tabled order paper question 307, which reads as follows: "Would the minister responsible for women's issues provide a list of the number of individuals that have been turned away from rape crisis centres in fiscal years 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90 by centre."

Standing order 95(d) states: "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

Mr Speaker, order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost five and a half months since I tabled this question.

The failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof." As a member of this assembly I feel that I have a right to the access of information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering this question. I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: You have indeed a valid point of order. No doubt the minister to whom your concerns are addressed has heard your remarks and you should anticipate a response.

Mr Eves: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d).

On 22 November 1990—we are in 1991 now, I believe—I tabled order paper question 197, which read as follows, and which I think is fairly serious: "Would the Minister of Health table a list by hospital of the number of patients waiting for heart surgery?"

Standing order 95(d) states, "The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming"—perhaps we could throw in there "embarrassing"—"or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister has made an interim answer, the approximate date that the information will be made available, or that the minister has declined to answer, as the case may be."

Order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days, yet it has been almost six months since I tabled this question.

An interim answer was provided on 20 December 1990, but that answer said that the information would be available on 30 January 1991. It has now been approximately three and a half months since the date that the information was to be have been made available.

Failure to answer order paper questions is also a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is refusal "to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof."

As a member of this assembly, I feel that I have a right to the access of information that is essential for me to do my job as a representative of the people of Ontario, not to mention the great number of people waiting on cardiovascular surgery lists throughout the province of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government has shown a blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not responding to this and other questions. Mr Speaker, I would ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: To the member for Parry Sound, you have a valid point of order. No doubt the Minister of Health has heard your concerns and you should anticipate a response.

Mr Harris: I rise on a point of order under standing order 95(d).

On 18 December 1990—that was last year—I tabled order paper questions 367 and 368, which read as follows: "Would the Premier prepare a list of all interministerial committees that have been in operation prior to September 1990, including the terms of reference for each committee, the membership of each committee and whether or not they have prepared any reports or recommendations."

The second question asked the Premier to: "...prepare a list of all interministerial task forces and committees which are currently in operation, the terms of reference for

each of these committees and whether or not they have made any reports or recommendations.”

These are important questions because these are potentially vast hundreds of millions of dollars being spent without any accountability and without us knowing unless the government will provide us with the information.

Standing order 95(d) states, “The minister shall answer such written questions within 14 calendar days unless he or she”—in this case the Premier—“indicates that more time is required because the answer will be costly or time-consuming or that he or she declines to answer, in which case a notation shall be made on the Orders and Notices paper following the question indicating that the minister”—or the Premier—“has made an interim answer, the approximate date the information will be available, or that the minister has declined the answer, as the case may be.”

Order paper questions are supposed to be answered within 14 days. That is so the opposition parties can do their job, do what we were elected to do, to have access to the information. Yet it has been almost five months since I tabled this question. An interim answer was provided on 2 April, but that answer predicted the information would be available on 12 April. It has now been one month since the date the information was to be made available.

Mr Speaker, the failure to answer order paper questions is also, as you know, a breach of privilege under the Legislative Assembly Act, paragraph 45(1)6, which states that a breach of privilege occurs when there is a refusal “to produce papers before the assembly or a committee thereof.” As a member of this assembly, I feel that I have a right to the access of information that is essential for me to do my job as representative of the people of Ontario.

Mr Speaker, it is your responsibility to ensure that the standing orders of this assembly are complied with. The government—in this case the Premier—has shown blatant disrespect for our standing orders by not answering this question. Mr Speaker, I ask you to take the necessary steps to enforce the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party has indeed a valid point of order. No doubt the Premier has heard his concerns and he should anticipate a response.

1410

STATEMENTS BY THE MINISTRY

LAND REGISTRATION

Hon Ms Churley: In an effort to meet our government's commitment to cost efficiency throughout the public sector and to improve customer service, the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations will be consolidating a number of its land registry offices across Ontario over the next year.

The integration of these offices with existing nearby operations will be of particular advantage to many of our clients. They will benefit from more convenient locations, better access to complete records, and more up-to-date facilities.

When the integration plan is complete, the government will save in the neighbourhood of \$1 million per year in operating costs. As well, this consolidation of services will

eliminate the need to spend as much as \$8 million in replacement and renovation expenses to older offices.

Land title searchers will no longer suffer the inconvenience of sometimes having to visit two land registry offices in the county plus the sheriff's office to complete their research. They will now find all the records for their county or regional municipality under one roof, and in an office situated in the same vicinity as the local sheriff. Most of the offices scheduled for integration are currently located in communities without a sheriff's office.

Land registry staff and their clients at these offices will also reap the benefits of new technology. Automation of land registry records will occur earlier at the new integrated facilities than it would have if the offices had remained separated.

Let me assure members that employees affected by the changes will be within reasonable commuting distance of their new offices. All classified employees will be offered positions at neighbouring offices or elsewhere in the ministry.

I am confident these changes will lead to faster and more efficient service for our clients and a better and more fulfilling workplace for our staff. At the same time, these changes will allow us to exercise fiscal responsibility to the advantage of all Ontario taxpayers.

I am tabling a list of the 14 offices that are affected. Letters and public announcements are being sent out today advising local community officials and clients of the changes.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Hon Mr Wildman: I am pleased to announce today, during National Forest Week, a program that will be the foundation for a new system of forest management in Ontario.

In the past, this province's forest programs have focused mainly on timber production, with some consideration for other social, environmental and economic benefits. The program I am announcing today involves a different approach, a sustainable forestry approach.

Sustainable forestry is management that ensures the long-term health of forest ecosystems. It means managing for all forest values, protecting old-growth ecosystems, reducing our dependence on chemical herbicides, involving the public in forest management decisions, and enhancing our forests in the south.

In 1991-92 the Ministry of Natural Resources will spend a total of \$10 million on a number of new initiatives that will accelerate our progress towards sustainable forestry. These initiatives largely involve increased research on forest ecosystems and silviculture, and greater public consultation on forest policy development.

We face several challenges in developing sustainable forestry:

We must protect and enhance our natural environment while nurturing a competitive forest products industry that provides long-term employment.

We must ensure there is a healthy forest that contributes global environmental benefits and which provides an array of social, cultural and economic opportunities now and in the future.

We need new information about our forests. We must improve our knowledge of forest ecosystems and alternative silvicultural systems through an increased commitment to research and development.

We must share this knowledge, because Ontarians from all walks of life need to be well informed if they are to help establish forest policy. In addition, we must give the public a real voice in what goes on in the forest. We must increase public participation in decision-making, and community involvement and empowerment through new forms of partnerships.

We have already begun to act. On 18 April, I announced details of an independent audit of the province's boreal forest, whereby we can accurately determine the level of artificial and natural regeneration in harvested areas. Results of that audit will be available in mid-1992.

In addition to the audit, five other steps that I am announcing today will pave the way for establishing sustainable forestry in Ontario. First, over the next two years we will set our course by developing a broad strategy to guide forest management, one that sets long-term objectives and addresses key issues.

To create this forest policy framework, I will appoint an independent three-person working group by September to identify issues and consult widely to determine what Ontarians want from their forests. The working group will also examine how the public and interest groups can become more involved in forest policy decision-making. It will also recommend a comprehensive forest policy framework to me by the fall of 1992. Once this framework is in place, we will realign existing policy to conform to it, and change our forest management practices accordingly.

To promote the redirection of our provincial program, we will introduce the concept of community forestry, a management system that gives communities a role in decisions about local forests. We will conduct workshops for the public, present potential models for consideration, and work with communities to test several new models for management.

Another area where we can proceed is silviculture. We will develop a silviculture plan which will include research on forest ecosystems and how they function, as well as biological diversity, the dynamics of forest stands and alternative silvicultural systems.

We will also develop programs to ensure that the new knowledge is promptly applied in the field, and that our vegetation management practices are aimed at reducing our dependence on forest herbicides.

In line with that commitment, I would like to announce that in the first year of the new program the ministry will reduce by 20% the aerial spraying of herbicides across the province. But one fifth less than last year means that 80,000 hectares will still be sprayed. The program I am announcing today recognizes the need to systematically reduce our dependence on chemical herbicides by using environmentally sensitive alternatives as they become available. We can have a successful forest renewal program and apply more stringent standards on herbicide use.

We will also develop a policy for the protection of old-growth ecosystems that is scientifically sound and

addresses both social and economic concerns. Guidelines will be in place for old-growth red and white pine by the spring of 1992, and a conservation strategy will be put into effect for old-growth ecosystems by 1993. In the meantime, significant old-growth red and white pine ecosystems will be protected from harvest.

In addition to these efforts, we will embark on a private woodlands strategy to promote sustainable forestry on private lands. We will co-ordinate policy development and program delivery with other ministries and agencies, including the ministries of Agriculture and Food; Industry, Trade and Technology; Northern Development and Mines; as well as the province's conservation authorities.

The goal is to establish MNR's private woodlands management program as a key contact point for the co-ordination and consolidation of all public inquiries and applications about private woodlands stewardship programs. This is the beginning of a move towards sustainable forestry, something that has been long overdue in this province.

What I have outlined today is a firm commitment by this government and the Ministry of Natural Resources to achieve sustainable forestry in this province. Our forests are important to the people of Ontario. They provide major environmental, social and economic benefits to the province and, if our efforts succeed, our forests will be a source of comfort and pride now and in the future for future generations.

1420

TOURISM AND RECREATION FOR THE DISABLED

Hon Mr North: I also have good news. Today our ministry launches the open for business program for the tourism and recreation industries. It will help remove barriers and change attitudes that keep persons with disabilities on the margin of community life.

This program will not only open doors a little wider; it will also open minds.

Our ministry has developed education kits that include a video and a workshop outline for staff as well as a guidebook on barrier-free design for operators of facilities.

By distributing these kits to the tourism and recreation industries we will be reaching hundreds of thousands of people. Our ministry will promote the program at our regional offices and through current programs.

We are also asking tourism operators to fill out access surveys about their properties. By 1992 the public will be able to get this information through our existing tourist publications and our consumer telephone information lines.

The open for business program will also have a national impact. For several years Ontario has had a leadership role on the federal-provincial committee on the needs of physically challenged travellers in Canada. We will share our findings, education program and our plans with other tourism ministers. Our long-range goal is to standardize services for consumers with disabilities all across Canada.

About 14% of Ontarians have disabilities. That is over 1.2 million people in Ontario alone. More than 90% live at

home, not in institutions. It makes good business sense to reach that tourism market and it makes good common sense to ensure that our community recreation facilities, built with everybody's tax dollars, can be enjoyed by everybody. Working together, we can welcome people with disabilities into the heart of community life.

Many people contributed to this program. I would like to acknowledge the groundwork done by the previous government. Our government has built on that work and we are committed to putting the goal of accessibility higher on the public agenda than ever before in the province of Ontario.

The open for business program grew directly from consultations with facility operators, community groups and people with disabilities.

Some of the people who worked hard on this program are in the House today and I would like to introduce them. They are Mark Wilson, Alan Sunisloe, Larry Brown, Joanne Yale, John Southern, Shawn Kirton and David McFarlane.

I would like to acknowledge the hard work of Debbie Reynolds and the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation staff, who have done so much for this program.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Mr Curling: On a point of privilege, Mr Speaker: This morning I learned from the Toronto Star that the Solicitor General had announced a tougher fire code law up in Markham.

I am appalled to know this. As a matter of fact, I am very disappointed in the minister. Even yesterday the acting House leader stood up in the House and made a point. Let me just quote from this because it is more accurate than I could ever put it: "I am sure that the member for the Conservative Party would remember that when this matter was dealt with"—and he is speaking on behalf of statements made outside the House—"his party and my party in opposition made a couple of points with respect to moving to orders of the day. The number one point was that we wanted to avoid the opposition parties having their right to ask questions taken away by the government, as the member has pointed out." This is the point I wanted you to listen very carefully to, Mr Speaker.

Also, as part of the standing orders, our rules very clearly allow the government ministers to make statements where the opposition parties have always said we should be making them, and that is in the House, rather than out in the public without be held accountable to the Legislature. As critic for the Solicitor General, I think the privilege has been denied, Mr Speaker, and I would like you to rule on this.

The Speaker: The member may know that, unfortunately for him, he does not have a point of order. There is nothing to oblige ministers to being restricted to announcing policy within the House.

Hon Mr Farnan: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With all due respect to the member from the opposition party, I would say to him that he has not read the speech I made in Markham yesterday, and how he can comment on a speech that he has not read, I fail to understand.

The Speaker: That is not a point of order.

RESPONSES

LAND REGISTRATION

Mr McClelland: I want to respond briefly to the statement made by the Minister for Consumer and Commercial Relations. We note on this side of the House that the announcement made by the minister was strictly an administrative matter and that it has in fact been in the works for some time, but it does raise a few questions that I hope the minister would certainly be prone to watch and be prepared to respond to.

We wonder on this side whether in fact the buildings that will be accommodating the transferred responsibilities will be able to handle the increased volumes. Will there be sufficient facilities in terms of parking and telephones and so forth for the client groups?

I also think that it is an issue to consider with respect to the inconvenience that it may cause to many clients of the group. I notice that the minister mentions on page 3 of her statement that she is assuring people that this will be within a reasonable commuting distance. It will be interesting to see how that subjective interpretation of what is in fact a reasonable commuting distance will apply to a variety of client groups.

I also note, from the information that I have, that I think the Lanark North office that is being transferred was opened less than a year ago. I wonder in terms of the rationale of transferring the facility of a virtually brand new office and wonder about the wisdom of that and the inconvenience that will add to the client groups. They will have to commute in some cases now well over an hour.

I note in closing, with some disappointment, that we have been here for about eight months with this new government, and there has not been one substantive announcement from the minister or the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, and we are looking forward to that. We hope that this administrative statement she has made today will not unduly affect a number of people, as we suspect it might, and we want to raise the concern that there will be many client groups that will be inconvenienced by this. I hope the minister will take that duly into account.

1430

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr Ramsay: In response to the Minister of Natural Resources' statement today, a comprehensive forest policy in this province is both needed and long overdue, one that integrates both timber and non-timber values. The minister will know that there was only \$6 million allocated to his operating budget this year. This 1.7% increase in his total budget is much less than inflation. We have to question whether this important initiative is adequately funded so that it has a chance of success.

Experts like Crandall Benson, as he knows, and Canadian forest service experts question whether the recently announced forest audit can be sufficiently funded for \$1.5 million. In fact, some say maybe \$15 million is needed. While a policy framework is critical, what ultimately

matters is what happens on the ground. Why wait until September?

There is little emphasis on regeneration in this statement, yet according to his own ministry's documents there are 3.4 million hectares of not sufficiently regenerated areas. This is far greater than the 300,000 hectares that the Ministry of Natural Resources attributes to regeneration backlog.

The NDP always promised changes in cutting patterns, such as the elimination of clear-cutting or severe restrictions on the amount of clear-cutting being done. This concept has been supported by such groups as Forests for Tomorrow, and of course at the timber environmental assessment hearings it has stated this. Changes must occur if the government is going to rely on natural regeneration.

We are also very concerned about the lack of detail here of where the old-growth discussion paper is. What assurances is the minister giving that the old growth in the 10 study areas and elsewhere will be protected? What about those areas in the northwest? Where is the timber production policy discussion paper? The time lines for completion are a long way off. There is also little clarification on community forests. Members are aware of the interesting proposals from Geraldton and such groups as the Conservation Council of Ontario. I say to the minister, we need to get on to this work.

TOURISM AND RECREATION FOR THE DISABLED

Mr Kwinter: I would like to commend the Minister of Tourism and Recreation on implementing the Open for Business program, which he graciously acknowledged was initiated by the previous government.

This program will stimulate interest on the part of tourist operators in providing barrier-free access to tourism and recreational facilities. For the 1.2 million disabled citizens of Ontario and the millions of potential visitors, this will indeed be a welcomed initiative. However, it would have made more business sense to support and encourage the tourist industry, which is the third largest industry in Ontario.

The 1991 provincial budget has been called a bitter blow by tourist operators. The budget makes no mention of tourism, increases taxes on small business, alcohol, cigarettes and gasoline, and all of these are going to have a negative impact on the industry.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr McLean: I am pleased to reply to the announcement by the Minister of Natural Resources. I am pleased to see this announcement taking my advice; I see it has been well received—the continuing commitment of the ministry to the proper and efficient management of Ontario forest resources.

We are pleased that the ministry is following up on the commitment to sustainable forestry in this province. Hopefully this new program will protect our valuable forest resources while at the same time promoting a competitive industry which will provide long-term employment opportunities. Close to 150,000 Ontario jobs depend directly or indirectly on the forest industry, and in northwestern

Ontario three quarters of all manufacturing jobs are forestry related.

In summary, I look forward to the execution of this program and the promotion and protection of our valuable forest resources. The alternative chemical program should be a priority with the minister, and I hope that it is.

TOURISM AND RECREATION FOR THE DISABLED

Mr J. Wilson: I welcome the opportunity to respond to the statement today from the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. It was indeed a noble gesture, and the goal of a more accessible Ontario is a good one which I think all members of this House would join in.

But today the minister has told us he is going to survey and study and send out an education program to tourism and recreation small business people. My fear, with the tourism operators and the tourism industry in such a decline, is that they are not going to have time to read his educational material or to view his video. They are too darned busy right now trying to make a living in this province, and many of them have gone bankrupt in the last few months.

I also wonder why money, precious dollars, are being taken out of the minister's budget when this should be done by the minister responsible for disability issues. The minister should not be taking money that should be going to assist tourism operators out of his budget when there are other provisions in the government to provide this type of service.

Tourism is in a decline this year. Some 10% to 15% decline in the number of tourists visiting Ontario is predicted for 1991. The government's gasoline taxes and liquor taxes have had a direct impact on this important industry. It is not only the third largest business operation in Ontario, it is the second largest private sector employer in Ontario and it is extremely important.

Instead of today's announcement, the operators themselves would prefer to have heard the minister's position, for instance, on Sunday shopping. They are hoping that he will go to bat for them in cabinet on that issue. They want to know what his position is on cross-border shopping.

The slogan "Ontario—Incredible!": The operators I talk to call it "Ontario—Incredibly Expensive!" and that is what she should be addressing in her ministry when other ministries provide facilities for accessibility.

LAND REGISTRATION

Mr Runciman: I want to respond briefly to the decision of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to close registry offices in small-town, rural Ontario.

This is an attack, an assault, on hard hit communities in this province; an ill-thought-out and heartless assault, I might say. There has been no discussion, no consultation with these communities. I do not think the minister has had any discussion or consideration of the impact, the spinoff, the movement of lawyers out of these communities, the kind of damage it is going to do to the whole sector in terms of rural Ontario.

The Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet and her buddies in the public service—she can give them an

increase of \$216 million and there are no comments about that. But this minister stands up and says, "We're going to get a saving of \$1 million per year," and the sheeplike, socialist saps in the back benches of this government applaud while they are inflicting a \$10-billion deficit on this province and having this kind of assault on small-town, rural Ontario.

Another element of this that is especially disturbing to the members on this side of the House—unprecedented, I might say, at first glance—is that 10 out of 14 of the communities being affected are in opposition-held ridings. It is very shoddy treatment of the loyal opposition in this province. I think it merits an investigation.

The minister is green. She is new to this job. She is following directions initiated by the former Liberal government. I do not think this government has thought this process out.

Interjections.

Mr Runciman: The government is having an assault. Government members are laughing about this injury they are inflicting on rural, small-town Ontario.

Hon Mr Cooke: We are laughing at you.

Mr Runciman: It is not a laughing matter. I want the government to reconsider this. It is not going to get any support from this side of this House, or co-operation, when it treats the real people in this province the way it is treating them now.

Interjections.

The Speaker: Well, I take it we are all relaxed now and certainly alert, awake and ready for question period.

ORAL QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENTARY PROCESS

Mr Nixon: I have a question for the Premier. I recognize that he is an expert in legislative obstruction from his record in opposition, but I just want to ask him if the situation now pertaining in the Legislature, which apparently is going to go on without limit, concerns him and if he has any plan to get the Legislature on a course of dealing with the business of Ontario in some direct and constructive way. Can he indicate what he intends to do about this situation?

Hon Mr Rae: I will say to the Leader of the Opposition, the thing that concerned me yesterday was the statement by the leader of the third party that he did not intend to let this Legislature deal with the budget, or I think to quote his words, he did not intend to let it pass. What concerns me is that the government does have a right to govern. I know it is difficult for other parties that have lost elections, but we do have a right to govern.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked, do we have any plans to deal with the listing of the lakes and the listing of private members' bills that have nothing at all to do with the order of business, which is the budget which was produced by the Treasurer last week and which we are ready to debate and to discuss any time, any place, in terms of the future of the province, but we would like to do it here.

I know that the House leader will be discussing with her counterparts the need for us to get on with House business. Obviously if the third party will not allow us to proceed, we will have to take steps to deal with that.

Mr Nixon: It is not at all clear, in spite of the enthusiasm of the leader's sycophants, what steps can be taken, because just as the leader of the government, when he was Leader of the Opposition, always did that kind of obstruction, which he was noted for—I cannot even remember what it was about, except they did not even let us read the budget, let alone debate the budget, he may well recall.

But it seems to me that the members of the third party have clearly put this forward in response to the rules, and if I may be so bold as to make a suggestion, I think they may have the Premier—how shall I put it—in a way in which he is going to have to respond somewhat positively.

1440

I do not want to associate myself with the requirement of the third party that this be sent out to some committee. As a matter of fact, my budgets were always so well received there was scarcely any comment in this House, let alone the committee.

It seems to me our party is not an obstructionist party. In government and in opposition, we have felt that the government of the day should be able to put forward its plans, have them debated and have them settled democratically.

Might I simply suggest to the Premier, rather than that implacable, stonewall, macho response, that he say, "Certainly." I do not even want to associate myself with that thing, but why not send it out to a committee? Why not have people discuss it? We can continue the debate here, where it should occur. Why not just do that? I do not think it is a big deal.

The bills, Mr Speaker, you would be aware—well, perhaps since you are getting uneasy, there will be an opportunity in a moment for me to consider. How about just sending it out? I do not want to recommend that, other than to say let's get on with the business.

Hon Mr Rae: Let me just say to the Leader of the Opposition that in praising himself and his role in government and opposition over many years, I will let him do that. He is doing it well. But I would just say to him that we on this side of the House, as the government, have produced a budget, which we think the House should be able to discuss. We think we should be able to discuss that freely and fairly, and we think the people in the province want us to do that.

The Leader of the Opposition is walking a very fine line. He is saying, "Oh, no, we don't condone this obstructionism, but, please, why don't you just give in to it?" I think he ought to think it through.

What we are proposing to the House is that the budget should be discussed. We think it should go to committee and be discussed in the sense that the bills will go to committee. We think the budget bill should be there. The estimates are now published. The estimates are ready to be discussed.

I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition that we have every intention of proceeding and the House leader

will be discussing with the other House leaders how we intend to do that.

Mr Nixon: In a sense, I am immodest enough to say that our party can act as an honest broker in this matter.

Hon Mr Hampton: Keep a straight face.

Mr Pouliot: Come on. You can even act as a broker.

Interjections.

Mr Nixon: In spite of all that crap, it is the truth, and I would say to members that there is no doubt that the budget bills, if we ever get to them, will go out to committee for review. Incidentally, in spite of what is going on in the House, the new gas tax is already being collected, the price of booze has already gone up and the price of cigarettes has already gone up.

Hon Mr Laughren: Just a little bit.

Mr Nixon: The Treasurer says, "Just a little bit," and I have heard of that defence in the past, but it just occurred to me that one of the simplest things is to do what the Premier has indicated he is quite prepared to do on almost every occasion, and that is to be open. Let's just send the document out to the committee for review. Hopefully the debate will continue here. I do not see that anyone has lost face. It could be that the leader of the third party has got his very attractive mug on the news a little more often, and no one objects to that. I would be the last to put any motives on his actions other than the very best.

The question is to the Premier and his rather truculent colleagues. It is not as if he is giving in to the hijacking of an airplane full of innocent NDP members, although that would be worth while. Why does he not just say, "Well, we can prepare to do that," and get the Legislature going on the business of the province again?

Hon Mr Rae: Those of us who were here earlier recall well the words of the member for Nepean. Listen to the words of the member for Nepean, describing the tactics of the Tory Party. I have not heard this from the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Nepean says, and this is a Liberal speaking, the Leader of the Opposition's own colleague:

"Such obstructionist buffoonery is shameful. It is unworthy of the dignity and importance of parliamentary government. The public has long lost patience with mindless partisanship in the face of urgent policy problems. The people of Ontario recognize the Tory plot for what it is, a clumsy attempt by the third-party leader to raise his own profile."

I could go on. If the Leader of the Opposition aspires to the role of honest broker, or pawnbroker or whatever kind of broker he wants to be, I suggest that he should negotiate between the member for Nepean and the leader of the third party. That is the kind of negotiation he should be interested in.

Mr Nixon: If the Premier is so obtuse that he cannot find help when it is proffered, then that is his problem. I leave him to the tender mercies of my colleagues to the big left. We will see how that works out.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

I have a question again, in the presence of the Attorney General, but I would like to direct it to the Premier. On 29 April the Attorney General stated that he expected the RCMP investigation into the Solicitor General's matter, if we can put it that way, would be completed last week. Can the Premier report to the House the status of that investigation and the disposition of it.

Hon Mr Rae: I will refer the matter to the Attorney General.

Mr Nixon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: If I may just simply add to the question, since the Attorney General indicated in response to my questions last week that it might not be appropriate if he received the report and that perhaps an independent investigator should have that responsibility, I thought perhaps I should put it to the Premier since he is the only one who can decide that.

Hon Mr Rae: The reason I referred the question, and I will stand by my referral, is that the Premier and the Premier's office have absolutely nothing to do with this question. These matters are determined exclusively by the Attorney General and have never been discussed by me with him.

Hon Mr Hampton: As of earlier this morning, we had not heard from the RCMP whether they had completed their investigation or not.

Mr Nixon: I know the Premier will be listening to this; at least I trust he will. The Attorney General is aware that because of information that he made public—it came from the Attorney General's office—that his staff had known about the letter 10 days before it became public, undoubtedly the investigation, if you want to call it that, or any questions into this event might very well deal with the Attorney General himself and his deputy herself and other law officers of the crown.

Hon Mr Rae: Nonsense; ridiculous; absurd.

Mr Nixon: The Premier did not want to answer this question. He is flopping around in his seat and saying that is ridiculous. I would simply ask the Attorney General if the RCMP have asked him about any of these circumstances or have got in touch with the Deputy Attorney General and asked her about the circumstances and if she has answered those questions. The Premier, who has nothing to do with this and does not want to know anything about it, seems to have very well formed and pronounced opinions.

If in fact the RCMP officers have talked to the Attorney General or to any of his staff about it, would he not agree that it is inappropriate that when they finally have the report ready, which was promised last week and is not ready yet, it should go to the Attorney General, who would be put in a position of reading the report and saying: "Yeah, that's what I said. Yeah, that's what the deputy said," rather than being given to an independent investigator who really should be named in this case?

1450

Hon Mr Hampton: First of all, to refer to the first question from the Leader of the Opposition, I have not

been contacted directly by the RCMP and to my knowledge the deputy minister has not been contacted directly by the RCMP. To my knowledge the only conversations that have been held between the RCMP and senior advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General have been about facts which were turned over to them concerning letters and allegations of letters. I would say further that while the Leader of the Opposition wants to make certain allegations, to my knowledge the RCMP have not in any way indicated that they have an area of concern there.

Finally, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that when it comes to law enforcement questions and administration of justice questions, those questions should come to the office of the Attorney General. In that sense, I have an independent role to play and I am trying my very best to fulfil that role. The Leader of the Opposition should understand that it would be improper in these circumstances for the report to go, for example, to any other cabinet minister's office, any other office in this government, and that it should come to senior legal advisers in the Ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr Nixon: The Attorney General, when he rather belatedly and awkwardly announced this investigation, indicated that it would be a full investigation into the incident, and he made it clear that no individuals were in any way suspect, that it was simply the circumstances. He indicated after that that he and his deputy were in fact a part of the incident, since she was directly informed 10 days before the letter arrived in a brown envelope in the Premier's office, although of course he was not involved with that in any way.

Surely the Premier would agree with my view that while the Attorney General has to have an independent position and, like all lawyers and attorneys general, tends to lecture the unwashed and unlearned in these matters, it would be very difficult for him to be independent of himself. Surely if the incident is going to be investigated, the Attorney General would be involved in it, and the Attorney General's deputy would, and surely he would see the value of at least committing to the House that the report would be made public. Can he do that at this time?

Hon Mr Hampton: I repeat my answer. All information was turned over to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police will conduct the investigation which they feel is justified in the circumstances. I have not heard from the RCMP either in my capacity as Attorney General or in my capacity as an MPP. To my knowledge, the Deputy Attorney General has not been interviewed by the RCMP. To my knowledge, the RCMP have been given all of the information, all of the facts. They will conduct the investigation that they feel is appropriate, and I wish the Leader of the Opposition would stop creating innuendo as to where the investigation might go or could have gone. The RCMP will decide what investigation should take place.

BUDGET

Mr Harris: I have a question for the Premier. I want to thank the leader of the Liberal Party for his efforts on our behalf. That is the party that introduced bell-ringing to

the Legislature when the member for Renfrew North rang the bells in opposition as a tactic to bring something to the attention of the government. However, I appreciate that since they introduced those tactics to the House, they understand the problem when a dictatorial majority government tramples on the rights of the minority parties.

In that context, I have a question for the Premier. In the 20 November throne speech, the Premier said, "We will look for new and better ways to hear and respond to the voices of the people." That is from the Premier's throne speech. I have heard those voices of the people. They are not happy ones. They are furious with this government's budget; not just the tax bills, by the way—and he is already collecting the taxes—but the overall budget, and they want to be heard. Does the Premier not feel that it is time for him to live up to his statement in the throne speech that it is time to listen to the people?

We are not interested in individual hearings on taxes that the Premier is already collecting and that he will already have ordered his members, in his dictatorial way, to support, "Because we can't refund the taxes." We are interested in hearings on the overall budget. Why will the Premier not live up to his statement in the throne speech to listen to the people before he asks members of this House to debate this budget?

Hon Mr Rae: I am sure that the people who have been watching the leader of the third party read out the name of every lake in the province will make a decision as to who is being dictatorial and who is not. But let me say I have heard it all: The Leader of the Opposition presents himself as an honest broker and the leader of the third party announces that he has been hearing voices.

I want to say to the leader of the third party very directly, let us deal with the budget. We have presented a budget which we have asked the House to consider, which would normally be followed by a debate, which has been done in every other case in the history of the province in terms of presenting a budget. That has always been done.

The leader of the third party stated in the House just yesterday, "People know where I stand on the budget; I am not going to let it pass." That is what he said yesterday. He is not interested in listening to the voices of the people. He has already made up his mind. He has already said under no circumstances is he going to let it pass.

The Speaker: Would the Premier conclude his remarks, please.

Hon Mr Rae: The only thing that the leader of the third party's tactic is doing, the only thing his tactic is accomplishing, is preventing his own members and other members and members on this side from discussing the budget, which is what I think the people of the province would be expecting us to do rather than reading out the names of every lake in the province.

Mr Harris: I think the people of this province are well aware that the budget which was brought down is 180 degrees in the opposite direction from what this government promised them in the last campaign. The taxpayers of Ontario are angry. Yesterday the Treasurer learned just how furious the business community is. But their anger is

not just about the individual budget bills; it is about the direction that this government has chosen; it is about this government's choice to try and spend its way out of this recession with \$10 billion of borrowed taxpayers' money, a disastrous choice.

Clearly I have made up my mind. The Premier knows where I stand. What I am simply asking the Premier—and we hear where he stands—is to honour the rhetoric that got him elected. He promised a new style. He promised a new openness. He promised full consultation. Why now is he opposed to at least listening to the public before he proceeds with this budget direction?

Hon Mr Rae: The suggestion that we are somehow opposed to listening to the people is preposterous. It is absolutely preposterous. I would say to the leader of the third party that we are determined to do that. We are very interested in doing that.

The leader of the third party suggests that somehow as a result of the last election, as a result of his experience, he has some kind of exclusive pipeline to the truth and he is hearing the voice of the people, which voice no one else can hear, and only he has access to that group. When he says that he is not going to let the budget pass, that he is not going to let the House deal with the budget, that he knows better than anybody else, I would say to him that we have to have some respect for the people. We have to have some respect for what happened in an election campaign. We have to show that.

The Speaker: Would the Premier conclude his remarks, please.

Hon Mr Rae: I would respectfully submit that in the conduct which the leader of the third party has demonstrated so far in the House he has not shown an awful lot of respect for the democratic process.

Mr Harris: Let me tell the Premier that the only pipeline I have is to the record, his record, what he said then and now the new "What I say now." He promised he was different. He said this was a government that consulted.

In January 1991—let me read him another quote—he said, this time in an open letter on the Constitution, "I can't promise to agree with every view, but speak to us and we'll be good listeners." The Premier said to the people, "Speak to us and we'll be good listeners."

1500

What has changed? Why will he not listen now? Surely debate on this budget should not be restricted to members of this House. Clearly he has articulated—so have I. Everybody knows where he stands. He is collecting the taxes now. We know where he stands. Everybody knows where I stand.

The Speaker: The supplementary.

Mr Harris: Is it not time we listened to the people? Is it not time we heard where the people stand? Why is the Premier so totally opposed to opening up debate on the total budget to the taxpayers of this province, the ones who are going to have to pay the price of this folly?

Hon Mr Rae: The party which is opposed to the budget debate is the party which is raising obstructionist tac-

tics day in and day out. That is the third party, that is the Conservative Party of Ontario.

It is bad enough that the federal Conservative Party has singlehandedly reduced this province to the worst recession in 50 years. Now we have the prospect of the third party saying, "Once the New Democrats win an election, we're not going to let them govern, we're not going to let them have the right to govern," and we have the Leader of the Opposition saying: "Why don't you just give in to that kind of obstructionism? It's not going to do any harm anyway." I think the New Democratic Party, which was elected on 6 September—

The Speaker: Could the Premier conclude his remarks?

Hon Mr Rae: —and sworn in on 1 October, has as much right to govern as the Tories did between—

The Speaker: Would the Premier take his seat, please. New question.

Mr Harris: Part of governing is listening to the people. The Premier promised that and he is not listening.

The Speaker: We were on to a new question.

CASE OF BRIAN RAPSON

Mr Harnick: My question is for the Attorney General. I would like to know why he has preferred an indictment of Police Constable Brian Rapson on a charge of attempted murder after he was discharged at a preliminary inquiry. What facts were relied on? What mistakes were made at the preliminary, in law or in fact by the judge? It is incumbent on the Attorney General to disclose this information to the public or the public will conclude that the action he has taken was only for political purposes. What facts and what law is he relying on? He should not tell me that he is hiding behind his senior advisers or the fact that it is in the courts and before the courts. That has nothing to do with it.

Hon Mr Hampton: Under section 577 of the Criminal Code the Attorney General of each province has the authority, in a given circumstance, to prefer an indictment following a preliminary inquiry. It is authority conferred by the Criminal Code. It is authority that is used, with great care and great consideration, only after the preliminary inquiry has been completed. That is what was done in this case. I took great care in reviewing the results of the preliminary inquiry and the decision of the judge in the preliminary inquiry, and I have the authority, under the Criminal Code, to prefer an indictment in these types of situations where I believe it is in furtherance of the administration of justice.

Mr Harnick: No one doubts the ability of the Attorney General to read section 577 of the Criminal Code and no one doubts that he has that authority. The public is entitled to know why he made a decision. I am asking him again, what facts did he rely on? I will put it to him that what he has done is no different than when a case is appealed. When a case is appealed, one sets out grounds for appeal. That is made public and it does not affect the right or the ability of a court to decide a matter.

I am asking the Attorney General to tell us what facts he is relying on in support of this, in a sense, appeal that he is taking. I think he owes it to the 6,000 members of the Metropolitan Toronto Police and he owes it to the police across this province and he owes it to the public. This is becoming a very usual thing—

The Speaker: We have the question.

Mr Harnick: —to see the Attorney General hiding and not disclosing what he is doing to the public.

The Speaker: We have the question now.

Mr Harnick: The minister should come clean and tell us the facts.

The Speaker: Will the member take his seat, please. We have the question.

Hon Mr Hampton: The member of the opposition should know that as Attorney General I have two roles. One is certainly a political role. It is the minister of justice role to bring legislation into the House and to present legislation. The other part of the job is essentially a very apolitical part of the job, and that is to ensure that the administration of justice in the province is conducted fairly and appropriately.

I am sure that given what the member of the opposition has already said, and that he has already made up his mind in this case, he would like me to discuss the case in some detail and therefore prejudice the integrity of the system. The case in question is now a matter before the court. I will make no further comment on it other than to say that when the preliminary inquiry was completed I sat down with the assistance of senior legal advisers. We looked at the decision of the judge in the preliminary inquiry and we made the determination that a preferred indictment was the proper course in this case.

Mr Harnick: That answer, with all due respect, was dumb. The reason that answer was dumb is because every time a case is appealed in this province the notice of appeal sets out the grounds for that appeal. All I am asking the Attorney General to do is tell us the grounds upon which he is preferring an indictment against this police officer after he has been discharged at a preliminary hearing.

This Attorney General constantly hides behind "It's before the courts," or "I discussed it with my senior officers." What does he have to hide? It is incumbent upon him to show the public that justice is being done. The only way he can do that and the only way he can show that he is not making a political decision is to disclose the facts to the public and to the police officers in this province. I am giving him a third opportunity to stand up and come clean and make that disclosure.

Hon Mr Hampton: I would respond again that this is a matter before the courts and I do not intend to comment upon it further.

Mr Speaker, I would point out to you section 23(g) of the standing orders, which says that in a debate a member shall be called to order by the Speaker if he or she "refers to any matter that is the subject of a proceeding that is pending in a court or before a judge for judicial determina-

tion." I would suggest to you that is exactly the matter we have here.

1510

EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Mr Beer: My question is to the Minister of Education. I want to deal with the minister's decision to cancel Ontario's participation in the national school achievement indicators program of the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. I think it is important in addressing this question that we ask ourselves why we have national assessment programs, why we have national assessment tests and why, over the last number of years, the council has worked very hard to develop those. It is important to underline that what we are doing here is assessing our systems; we are not testing children. There are four reasons that I would like to just outline briefly.

First of all, we are carrying out these assessments because we want to compare how well the Ontario system is doing and how well students are learning.

Second, we want to stimulate reform and focus public demand for quality in education.

Third, we want to ensure that public confidence in our system is well placed and, most important, that the whole system, including government, is accountable for the system of education.

Finally, it allows us to use evaluation as a tool to improve instruction and our system, because the sad fact is that a third of all our youth are high school dropouts and 15% of high school graduates are functionally illiterate.

Given the value of these four reasons for carrying out national assessment, why would the Minister of Education of the largest province in the country conclude that Ontario should withdraw from national school tests and how does she propose to ensure that the education received by children in this province is both relevant and competitive?

Hon Mrs Boyd: We are very concerned that we be accountable to the taxpayers of Ontario and to the parents and its children, and that is one of the major reasons that we have decided not to participate in the national standards test at this time. We do not believe that it will give us the kind of information that the honourable member suggested we ought to have to improve our system.

It is not a curriculum-based kind of test. We asked if we could not work together with the other provinces to develop a curriculum-based test that would in fact help us to improve our system. A standardized testing system allows an outside body—in this case two other provinces whose systems of education are quite different from ours in Ontario—to determine what it is we ought to be teaching our students.

We are saying that what we need to do is make that determination here to test our system against the curriculum that we do, and we are doing that through our benchmarks program.

Mr Beer: I certainly hoped the day would never come when in Ontario we would be afraid of having other jurisdictions, whether within this country or outside it, to assess the way in which we are providing education.

I want to ask for a commitment from the minister. She must be aware of the important role that the Council of Ministers of Education plays in this country and indeed that Ontario was instrumental in founding the council some years ago.

The issues that she has raised are valid, and one accepts that those would need to be discussed in looking at an assessment system, but I think all those involved say those can be dealt with. It is essential that we in Ontario not threaten this particular initiative and, in particular, the role of the council itself because there are very few national institutions that work as well as the council. As the minister knows, this is one of the national institutions where the province of Quebec is a full partner, a full player, and indeed is very active in proceeding with this particular project.

The commitment that I ask the minister for is, will she commit today in this House to reopen discussions with her colleagues to ensure that Ontario can participate in this project, which is to begin in 1993, and will she, upon the successful conclusion of those discussions, report back to the House?

Hon Mrs Boyd: The honourable member suggests that there has not been a great deal of discussion that has gone into this. That is not so. In September, and again in November, my deputy minister attempted to get the kinds of issues that we have raised dealt with. I met with the ministers in December and again in February. We had very extensive discussions and my colleagues in the other provinces refused to deal with the three issues that Ontario raised. The first was the curriculum base, the second was the size of the sample and the demographics of the sample and the third was the necessity for us to consult with our partners in education, our stakeholders. They would not give on any of those.

We are in an observer status. We have the option of opting in if any of those questions are answered and if our colleagues are prepared to deal with them, but if they are not, no, I will not make that commitment.

Mrs Cunningham: I too have a question for the Minister of Education and will follow on the same lines that my colleague has been questioning her on.

We are all very concerned that in Canada today parents, students and the business community are very concerned about the quality of education. We in Ontario have been told more recently that our secondary school graduates in fact are improving in their literacy skills, in their numeracy skills. It appears that right now, even if we were to look at that aspect of the testing, we should not be particularly concerned about it.

We have an opportunity now Canada-wide, and I will say for the first time ever, to do something. I heard the minister say she had the opportunity to opt back in. One of the aspects is a pilot project for 1992. Will she get involved in at least a pilot project for Ontario, as the other provinces are doing for 1992?

Hon Mrs Boyd: We are involved in a number of projects, and the major one is the benchmarks project that I mentioned in the House last week. The basis of that is for

us to determine within our curriculum base in Ontario what the standard of achievement ought to be for our children at the various levels and to measure the teaching that is being done and the learning that is being done against those standards, not outside standards provided by someone who is not involved in our system. We are already involved in that. The curriculum-based international science and math tests we do participate in because they are curriculum-based and because the sample is larger. So we are not averse to testing the teaching and learning of our students, but what we need to do is to make sure that is going to be valuable to us in making our system accountable in terms of the decisions we make in Ontario about the curriculum our children are learning.

Mrs Cunningham: I am really concerned with that answer. At a time in Canada right now when we have an opportunity to pull together, I think is the wrong time for Ontario, which has shown the leadership in the past, especially in education, to be the province that sits back and does not take the leadership.

I am very much aware of the testing and the standards work that is being done within the ministry, very much aware of benchmarks. I am very much aware of what we are trying to do in improving our quality of testing. But this kind of testing is geared to asking 13-year-olds, eighth graders, if you wish, 16-year-olds, the young people we are concerned about, the dropouts we refer to, who could leave our system not just in Ontario but right across Canada.

Surely to goodness in the leadership of the past Ontario thought this was important. Why do we not think it is important now to work along, for the first time ever? These discussions began in 1987-88. Why would we be opting out when the instruments have not even been put together? Why are we not having input and hanging in there and showing the leadership that we have shown in the past?

Hon Mrs Boyd: We are not participating because we could not get the co-operation of our colleagues in ensuring that our needs were met. We did everything we could over a number of months to try and say that we wanted to participate, but that we would not participate unless some of Ontario's needs were met. The member should know that we can certainly show those efforts, both in the written presentations that we made and in terms of the discussions that were held.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr Morrow: My question is for the Minister of Labour. As the minister is aware, the number of fatalities in the construction industry increased by 12% in 1990. In the first few months of this year there is no sign of any significant improvement to these tragic figures. There are signs that, because of the recession, construction workers are being pressed into complying with safety regulations if they take a little extra time or cost money. What is the minister going to do to put a stop to these needless tragedies and better protect the lives of construction workers?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: I agree with the member that we must do whatever we can to reduce the incidence of fatalities to zero. I am personally very saddened that the number

of fatalities went up in 1990. I see the investigative reports on each and every fatality, and most of them need not have happened.

I can tell the member that we are in the process of bringing in new construction regulations in the occupational health and safety area and that it will be a major overhaul of the existing regulations. If they are enforced as we intend to, it should reduce the fatalities in the construction industry.

Mr Morrow: I have been told that many of the large construction companies are trying to limit how often their joint health and safety and workers' trade committees meet. I have also heard that some companies are harassing health and safety representatives on construction sites. In fact, I understand that there have been cases before the Ontario Labour Relations Board where health and safety representatives for workers have been fired for trying to enforce the law. Can the minister put a stop to this so that the health and safety representatives of construction workers can do their job of saving lives without fear of losing their employment?

Hon Mr Mackenzie: The member will know that I cannot comment on any cases that are before the labour relations board, but I can tell the member that we take a very dim view of employers in any sector who harass or intimidate the workers on the site and deny them their duties under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. If it is demonstrated to us that employers are using these kinds of activities, we simply will not tolerate them in the province of Ontario, and if they have disrespect for our health and safety laws, we are prepared to act.

1520

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr Ramsay: Earlier today the Minister of Natural Resources made a very important statement on the future of sustainable forestry in this great province of ours today. That was listed at a cost of \$10 million.

There is a problem here, though, because, as we know, last week the Treasurer very generously gave—if you can call it that—\$6 million in new dollars to the Minister of Natural Resources. There is a shortfall there compared to the new dollars allocated to the Minister of Natural Resources and this new program today. In fact, the Minister of Natural Resources, to whom I am asking this question, has already allocated \$1.5 million for the forestry audit, which was well received a couple of weeks ago.

With the across-the-board salary increases of 6%, it would seem to me that the MNR cupboard is bare. I would like to ask the minister, where is he going to get the money and what program initiatives is he going to be cutting in the MNR in order to fund the new sustainable forestry initiative?

Hon Mr Wildman: The member should be made aware that the \$1.5-million estimate for the forestry audit that was already announced, and, as he said, has been well received, is not part of the funding that is included in the sustainable forestry approach. That was being funded through the ministry's normal process previously.

The \$10 million referred to is actually about \$9.7 million. It is funded through new allocations and a reallocation of resources within the ministry. Obviously if we are cutting spraying, for instance, that is saving some moneys for the ministry, as are decisions with regard to funding of road construction for forest management agreements and others.

I can assure the member that the \$10 million referred to is going to be allocated this year to sustainable forestry. We are serious about it.

The Speaker: Would the minister conclude his remarks, please.

Hon Mr Wildman: Part of it is new money and part of it is through a reallocation within the ministry's budget.

Mr Ramsay: The minister alludes to program cuts. To me, reallocation is really a code word for program cuts. If you are reallocating money, you must be decreasing the amount of funding to some programs or cutting others. It is the minister's prerogative to do that, and I accept that. The trouble is when those cuts and decisions of reducing program costs are not public and there is no discussion. That is where the problem is, and we would like to know where those cuts are.

Given that the minister has only had a 1.7% budget increase that obviously is very much lower than the rate of inflation this year, putting his ministry in a negative growth position, will the minister tell this House, where is he going to be getting this money? What programs of the Ministry of Natural Resources is he going to be cutting this year?

Hon Mr Wildman: Mr Speaker, as you will well know, the estimates for all ministries, including the Ministry of Natural Resources, are being tabled today. There is no secret about this. It is clear in the estimates what we are doing and where we will be allocating funds. That is there for all to see in the normal estimates process. I will be happy to debate the estimates with members of the House at the appropriate time.

I indicated in my previous answer some of the areas where within the forestry program we are reallocating funding. We are determined that we will change the direction of forestry in this province so that the next generation into the 21st century will indeed have a forest—not just timber, but all of the values that we value in our forest—to enjoy and to benefit from, unlike the approach that was taken by previous governments in this province.

TVONTARIO

Mrs Marland: My question is to the Minister of Culture and Communications. Yesterday this minister said he would investigate allegations into TVOntario's expenditures. They have spent \$2 million renovating a building that they are planning to vacate in 1994. The renovations included a new boardroom, a new dining room and the library has moved twice. I think what is most interesting is that the chairman's office has an entire wall with nine televisions in it. The chairman says he needs this in order to watch what his competition is doing. I guess if he is doing that, he does not need the boardroom.

This is a public agency that solicited funds to the tune of \$3.5 million from the public. Members of this Legislature in fact helped raise money for TVO, and none of these costs were included in the budget of TVO that was submitted to the government earlier this year.

Obviously, \$2 million would go a very long way to help some of the artists the minister himself referred to yesterday who live just above the poverty line. What steps will this minister take to ensure that this mismanagement of public funds by TVO does not continue? I draw to the attention of the minister that there already is a report out on the plans for them to move, so that does not need an investigation.

Hon Mr Marchese: I want to say at the outset that I am very interested in ensuring that money that is spent by any of the agencies connected to my ministry is managed well and managed effectively. A number of allegations have been made, and to this end we will take this review, step by step, which I have done.

I have spoken to the deputy in order to be able to get all the information we need to address some of the questions that have been raised. I have asked the deputy as well to review the third-quarter financial report that has been given to them, to work with TVOntario to determine if further information is required.

What I can say is that I am looking at the complete renovation project to ensure ourselves that TVOntario has appropriate administrative control mechanisms in place and to make sure and identify if any corrective management actions are necessary.

Mrs Marland: The renovations have been completed, and quite a number of them were done even without an estimate or any cost controls. What the minister is assuring us is no assurance at all.

If this minister has some question in his mind about whether TVO wastes public funds, I draw his attention to this publication. He answered a question on an order paper question to me. This publication is celebrating their 20th anniversary. It is called Stay Tuned for the Future. This book cost \$125,000 for 5,000 copies.

The Speaker: And your question?

Mrs Marland: This means \$25 a copy for a book that was distributed free by TVO. I would suggest to this minister that he does not have to look very far to see a very concrete evidence of waste of public funds by TVO.

I ask this minister again what he will do to ensure that the money allocated to TVO is spent on quality programming, rather than extravagant renovations, which have already been done, and flashy publications.

Hon Mr Marchese: The member makes a number of allegations as well about extravagant renovations that have been done. This is what I am doing: I have asked the deputy—

Interjections.

Hon Mr Marchese: She has raised several questions. I am attempting to address them.

In terms of the renovations, we are looking into that. I have asked the deputy to get all the required information to address that.

With respect to the publication, it is an agency of my ministry, a schedule 3. The board of directors obviously approved these kinds of publications. With respect to the publication, it is difficult for me to comment how much is appropriate to spend on a publication. They make those decisions on any publication they make, and I feel that they need to take that kind of responsibility in their decision-making.

1530

POLICE DRESS CODE

Mr Duignan: My question is to the Solicitor General. An article in today's Toronto Star suggests the province is considering revising the police dress code in this province. Would the minister inform the House as to the status of this review?

Hon Mr Farnan: The member is quite correct. Dress standards for police services do fall under regulation, and indeed this—

Interjections.

The Speaker: I, like many other members, am interested in hearing the response.

Hon Mr Farnan: All of these regulations are being reviewed by our external consultative committee. In this group we have the Municipal Police Authorities, the Police Association of Ontario, and the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. We will also consult with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and various other—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Each member in this assembly has the right to be heard when asking a question. Each person responding has the right to be heard. I have a responsibility to hear. At this point so far I have been unable to hear the response from the Solicitor General.

Hon Mr Farnan: For the benefit of the members who did not hear, I will repeat what I said. Dress for police services comes under regulation. Regulation is taken care of with the assistance of an external review committee.

Interjections.

The Speaker: If any individual member is intent upon shouting down another member, it would be necessary to name such member. I intend to hear the response, just as I intend to hear each question which is posed.

Hon Mr Farnan: This issue will indeed be tabled with the consultative committee, and in due course I will be bringing forward the results of not only the consultation with an external consultative committee but with other groups across the province.

Mr Duignan: My supplementary is again to the Solicitor General. Would the minister explain how this review of the dress code supports the minister's employment equity initiatives?

Hon Mr Farnan: Of course, I would hope that all members of this House would support employment equity within this province. As we look at ways of removing systemic barriers to groups within the province, whether these barriers be religious or cultural, I would expect the support of all members of the House to ensure that policing

reflects the face of Ontario and that we have true employment equity. Indeed, a dress regulation will support, I believe, in the long run, employment equity within the province of Ontario.

FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mrs Sullivan: My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources, following his statement today on sustainable forestry. Last summer the member for St Catharines, who was then Minister of the Environment, referred several individual timber environmental assessments to the environmental assessment advisory committee for recommendations on individual EA bump-ups. The current Minister of the Environment has also agreed to the procedure for a type A review, and EAAC met in Timmins, Sault Ste Marie and Wawa in February of this year.

EAAC was expected to report to the minister on 15 March of this year. It has yet to report and I understand that it is unlikely that the report will be finished and delivered to the Minister of the Environment until some time next month.

The Minister of Natural Resources wrote a letter to a tourist operator in his riding on 4 December assuring him that the timber management activities in the area of this environmental assessment request would be frozen until a decision was rendered. Will the minister assure the House that he will extend his promise of last December so that the timber management activities, including roadbuilding, approved in the current work schedule would be put on hold until the EAAC report is made public?

Hon Mr Wildman: The member is correct in her description of the history except in her statement that the former Minister of the Environment asked for EAAC to hold hearings last summer. In fact it happened just a week before election day, as I recall.

Indeed, the hearings were held. As I understand it, my colleague the Minister of the Environment has been asked by EAAC for an extension of the time when it will make a report. The member, I think, is correct in saying that the report will probably come down by the end of this March. I have made assurances to the tourist outfitter who is interested in the particular outcome of this EAAC hearing that we will put things on hold. At this particular time I do not see any reason why we would change that assurance.

Mrs Sullivan: The minister is probably aware that new annual work schedules came into effect on 1 April of this year, and in the areas where he froze activity until the EAAC report was to be delivered. Despite his promise, despite his assurance today in the House, logging is taking place today in Jessiman township, and as well, old pine trees are being cut. Roadbuilding plans have been approved, new cutting licences have been issued since 1 April, and the cutting licences can be exercised immediately in Havrot and Foulds townships.

In light of the minister's sustainable forestry announcement today and the environmental assessment process which is under way, can the minister explain the inconsistencies of these activities and why he is allowing them to continue?

Hon Mr Wildman: I do not acknowledge any inconsistencies whatsoever. The fact is that we are committed to sustainable forestry. If the information that the member is presenting to the House today is accurate, I will review it. I will review it to determine that indeed we do comply with the commitment we have made for the EAAC process. We are certainly determined to protect the identified old-growth sites of red and white pine in the province.

It is unfortunate that the previous Minister of the Environment sat on those applications for over two years; otherwise the whole process could have been completed before this.

CORRECTION

Mr Harris: In question period today when I referred to the Liberal Party ringing the bells in 1982 and introducing bell-ringing to the Legislature, I indicated that the member for Renfrew North, I believe, was behind that. I was in error. The member for Renfrew North was not here. In fact, he was out of the country. It was the member for Brant-Haldimand, who was the House leader at the time and is the current leader of the Liberal Party, who as House leader led the charge, hijacked the House for three days, and rang the bells on a budget bill, I believe it was, in 1982. I apologize to the member for Renfrew North.

The Speaker: Thank you for correcting the record.

1540

MOTIONS

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Miss Martel moved that the House proceed to orders of the day.

Mr Eves: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: With respect to the motion that has just been made, I would ask the government House leader to confer with her colleague the Minister of Housing, because I am sure he would not agree that such a motion is in order. I would like to tell her what the Minister of Housing, then the House leader for the New Democratic Party, had to say about exactly such a motion on 10 April 1990:

"I am suggesting a process whereby we get to orders of the day. The government House leader is attempting to change the standing orders of the House by a motion, without even notice to the opposition parties and without discussion. I would suggest that the motion is out of order completely." The House leader at the time went on to say—

Interjections.

The Speaker: Just relax. Could I have the attention of the member for Parry Sound, please?

We have been over this ground on a previous occasion. If there is any new information which has not been brought to my attention, I certainly would be pleased to hear it, but otherwise we should move on.

Mr Eves: Mr Speaker, I did not know whether you had the advice of the Minister of Housing, who thinks that such a motion is totally out of order under standing order 29 and standing order 46.

Hon Miss Martel: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: It seems to me that you ruled on this very matter on Thursday and I would suggest we should get on with the business.

The Speaker: To the government House leader and all other interested members, it is a responsible position for the Speaker to entertain any new information which members may wish to bring to the Speaker's attention, and that is precisely what I have done.

Mr Sterling: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: You may recall that yesterday I raised a point of order dealing with a dilatory motion, as we are dealing with today. You indicated at that time that you viewed the previous rulings by Speaker Edighoffer on this matter, such that my motion would fall under rule 44(a).

One of the very salient points in the argument that I put forward was that what seems to be good for the goose is not good for the gander, and that is that a motion by the opposition parties to speed along the process to question period during orders of the day was not in order, yet a motion by the government House leader to speed the process on to orders of the day happens to be in order.

I do not think it is necessary, as I said yesterday, that a dilatory motion of this sort be necessarily exclusive to the period after question period, as I explained yesterday. I was wondering whether or not you would take this example as the exact example that I was looking for yesterday as to why the expansion of the ruling of a dilatory motion prior to question period is not necessary. I wanted to point that out because it was only yesterday that I raised it, and today we see the government House leader trying to take advantage of the rules for government purposes at the expense of the opposition.

The Speaker: The member for Carleton raised a point of order with me yesterday. That matter is still under consideration. I anticipate a response to him, I hope, tomorrow. The government House leader has moved that the House now move to—

Mr Jackson: A point of order, Mr Speaker: I simply want to suggest that you might consider the argument of fairness. I have only one petition to table today on whose behalf the individuals have travelled some distance to be in the House at the time the petition is read. I simply suggest to you that there may be an element of fairness in your ruling since there was no notice in this regard.

The Speaker: While we have a motion on the floor, certainly if the House gave unanimous consent, the member could introduce his one petition. Do we have unanimous consent to do so?

Some hon members: No.

Negatived.

1615

The House divided on Miss Martel's motion, which was agreed to on the following vote:

Ayes 59; nays 33.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MORTGAGES AMENDMENT ACT, 1990

Mr Hampton moved second reading of Bill 40, An Act to amend the Mortgages Act.

Hon Mr Hampton: Today I am presenting for second reading the Mortgages Amendment Act, 1990, which will further protect the rights of tenants in Ontario, in particular tenants who may be evicted through no fault of their own.

It is a fact that many millions of Ontario residents are tenants, renting their homes from others. While some of these people may some day buy their own homes, others will remain tenants. The law now recognizes the right of tenants to secure tenure, and the ability of landlords to evict tenants from their homes is strictly limited by the Landlord and Tenant Act, the provisions of which have been reinforced in numerous court decisions.

However, there is presently a gap in that protection. If a landlord defaults on the mortgage on the premises, the courts have held that most mortgagees can evict tenants without regard to the Landlord and Tenant Act. Tenants in these circumstances are only protected if their tenancy agreement was in effect at the date of the mortgage.

In January 1990, the previous government announced that it would remedy this situation by ensuring that mortgagees of multiple-unit buildings would have to abide by the eviction provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act. However, the legislation was not ready for introduction before the last election.

The Mortgages Amendment Act, 1990 goes far beyond what the previous government announced.

First, it binds all mortgages to the general eviction provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Second, it also binds all mortgagees in possession of the premises to all the other provisions of the act that apply to residential premises, such as the obligation to keep up the premises and not to interfere with the tenants' reasonable enjoyment of them.

Third, it extends protection to tenants of single-family homes, a group left out of the previous government's announcement. We are talking here not only about people renting condominium units or whole houses but also the more numerous group who live in converted basement or attic apartments and the like in these houses.

Special provisions apply to single-family homes to balance the interests of the tenants with the ability of mortgagees to resell the properties to recover the money owing to them. Essentially, the tenants can stay up to 60 days after the mortgagee has made a firm agreement to sell the property to someone who indicates that he intends to occupy the premises personally. Tenants will have an opportunity to test the purchaser's intention in court if they choose.

The protection given to tenants in premises that are not single-family homes applies as of 26 January 1990 as announced by the previous government. The protection to tenants in single-family homes applies as of 20 December 1990. The other provisions of the act will come into force on royal assent. In all cases the act will apply to existing, as well as future, mortgages.

This legislation helps to fill a gap in the law that has caused real hardship to some tenants in Ontario. I am confident that we will achieve a fair balance of all the interests involved. To further that, the Ministry of the Attorney General conducted extensive consultations with all parties involved in this matter and I am of the belief that we have achieved a fair balance of all the interests.

Mr Harris: I want to say a few things about this particular bill. When you put this bill into the context of the overall budgetary policy of the government, we believe that it will substantially limit the ability of the private sector to get mortgages, that it will substantially reduce the amount of affordable housing that will be made available and that it will substantially increase the deficit if the only people who are going to be building housing is the government. What this will lead to is housing being built at \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 a unit more than what the private sector is prepared to build it for.

In view of all that, and also the fact that the whole budgetary policy is one that will bankrupt this province, is 180 degrees in the wrong direction and is not at all what the people were led to believe, we think the Premier and the Treasurer, who is yapping, not from his own seat, ought to consider allowing the public to have its say on the budget and the impact that even this bill will have on it.

Therefore, I move the adjournment of the debate.

1655

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 15; nays 73.

Mr Harris: I think the Premier needs a little more time to consider whether he is going to hear the public, so I move adjournment of the House.

1729

The House divided on Mr Harris's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 16; nays 66.

Mr Ferguson: This act, which most members of the House are intimately familiar with, is going to serve those people in the province of Ontario most in need. I want to tell the members that is what this government is all about. Unlike some of the members opposite who wish not to have a debate in the House on the budget, this government is committed to passing legislation that serves people in need.

While the Tories grandstand, which prohibits us from passing acts like the amendment to the Mortgages Act, what the public needs to be reminded about is that they are hurting the people of Ontario by keeping important legislation from being debated and passed in this House, important legislation like Bill 17, which provides for the automatic collection of support payments by way of deduction from wages. It is estimated that \$334 million is outstanding, which they are preventing being collected by those who deserve it.

They are prohibiting Bill 70 from being passed. This is the employee wage protection program, which provides for protection of workers in the province of Ontario who are laid off. It is their fault. They will have to answer to the workers of Ontario as to why they are holding up this legislation.

They are not fooling anyone. The people of this province know exactly what is taking place in the Legislature of Ontario today, that they are holding up democracy and hurting the people of this province.

Mr Harnick: I will have many things to say about this bill, but as a preliminary comment, this is a bad bill because it does not exempt all single-family homes. Because of that, it is a bad bill.

I think we should all reflect on that, and I would move adjournment of the debate for that purpose.

1802

The House divided on Mr Harnick's motion, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes 12; nays 61.

The House adjourned at 1803.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Lieutenant Governor: Hon Lincoln M. Alexander, PC, QC

Speaker: Hon David Warner

Clerk of the Legislative Assembly: Claude L. DesRosiers

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees: Smirle Forsyth

Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Journals: Alex D. McFedries

Sergeant at Arms: Thomas Stelling

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Abel, Donald	Wentworth North	NDP	
Akande, Hon Zanana L.	St Andrew-St Patrick	NDP	Minister of Community and Social Services
Allen, Hon Richard	Hamilton West	NDP	Minister of Colleges and Universities, Minister of Skills Development
Arnott, Ted	Wellington	PC	
Beer, Charles	York North	Lib	
Bisson, Gilles	Cochrane South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Mines and to the Minister of Northern Development Vice-Chair, standing committee on Ontario in Confederation Minister of Education
Boyd, Hon Marion	London Centre	NDP	
Bradley, James J.	St Catharines	Lib	
Brown, Michael A.	Algoma-Manitoulin	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on general government Minister of Agriculture and Food Chair, standing committee on public accounts Chair, standing committee on social development
Buchanan, Hon Elmer	Hastings-Peterborough	NDP	
Callahan, Robert V.	Brampton South	Lib	
Caplan, Elinor	Oriole	Lib	
Carr, Gary	Oakville South	PC	
Carter, Hon Jenny	Peterborough	NDP	Minister of Energy
Charlton, Hon Brian A.	Hamilton Mountain	NDP	Minister of Financial Institutions
Chiarelli, Robert	Ottawa West	Lib	
Christopherson, David	Hamilton Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Economics Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Churley, Hon Marilyn	Riverdale	NDP	
Cleary, John C.	Cornwall	Lib	
Conway, Sean G.	Renfrew North	Lib	
Cooke, Hon David S.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP	Minister of Housing, Minister of Municipal Affairs
Cooper, Mike	Kitchener-Wilmot	NDP	
Coppen, Hon Shirley	Niagara South	NDP	Minister without Portfolio, chief government whip Vice-Chair, standing committee on social development
Cordiano, Joseph	Lawrence	Lib	
Cousens, W. Donald	Markham	PC	
Cunningham, Dianne E.	London North	PC	Chief whip
Curling, Alvin	Scarborough North	Lib	
Dadamo, George	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transportation
Daigeler, Hans	Nepean	Lib	
Drainville, Dennis	Victoria-Haliburton	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct House leader House leader
Duignan, Noel	Halton North	NDP	Solicitor General, Minister of Correctional Services, minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Elston, Murray J.	Bruce	Lib	
Eves, Ernie L.	Parry Sound	PC	
Farnan, Hon Mike	Cambridge	NDP	
Fawcett, Joan M.	Northumberland	Lib	
Ferguson, Will	Kitchener	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Municipal Affairs Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Fletcher, Derek	Guelph	NDP	
Frankford, Robert	Scarborough East	NDP	
Gigantes, Evelyn	Ottawa Centre	NDP	
Grandmaître, Bernard	Ottawa East	Lib	
Grier, Hon Ruth A.	Etobicoke-Lakeshore	NDP	Minister of the Environment Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities
Haeck, Christel	St Catharines-Brock	NDP	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Hampton, Hon Howard	Rainy River	NDP	Attorney General
Hansen, Ron	Lincoln	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Harnick, Charles	Willowdale	PC	
Harrington, Margaret H.	Niagara Falls	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing
Harris, Michael D.	Nipissing	PC	Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party
Haslam, Karen	Perth	NDP	First Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Hayes, Pat	Essex-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Henderson, D. James	Etobicoke-Humber	Lib	
Hope, Randy R.	Chatham-Kent	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Huget, Bob	Sarnia	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Jackson, Cameron	Burlington South	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Energy
Jamison, Norman	Norfolk	NDP	Chair, standing committee on estimates
Johnson, Paul R.	Prince Edward-Lennox-South Hastings	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Jordan, Leo	Lanark-Renfrew	PC	Parliamentary assistant to the Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Klopp, Paul	Huron	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Kormos, Peter	Welland-Thorold	NDP	Chair, standing committee on resources development
Kwinter, Monte	Wilson Heights	Lib	
Lankin, Hon Frances	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP	Minister of Health, Chair of the Management Board of Cabinet
Laughren, Hon Floyd	Nickel Belt	NDP	Deputy Premier, Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics
Lessard, Wayne	Windsor-Walkerville	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Financial Institutions
Mackenzie, Hon Bob	Hamilton East	NDP	Minister of Labour
MacKinnon, Ellen	Lambton	NDP	Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Legislative Assembly
Mahoney, Steven W.	Mississauga West	Lib	Chief whip
Malkowski, Gary	York East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Citizenship
Mammoliti, George	Yorkview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for the provincial anti-drug strategy
Mancini, Remo	Essex South	Lib	Chair, standing committee on general government
Marchese, Hon Rosario	Fort York	NDP	Minister of Culture and Communications
Marland, Margaret	Mississauga South	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on estimates
Martel, Hon Shelley	Sudbury East	NDP	Minister of Northern Development, government House leader
Martin, Tony	Sault Ste Marie	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Education
Mathysen, Irene	Middlesex	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment
McClelland, Carman	Brampton North	Lib	
McGuinty, Dalton	Ottawa South	Lib	
McLean, Allan K.	Simcoe East	PC	Vice-Chair, standing committee on government agencies
McLeod, Lyn	Fort William	Lib	
Miclash, Frank	Kenora	Lib	
Mills, Gordon	Durham East	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Solicitor General
Morin, Gilles E.	Carleton East	Lib	Deputy Speaker, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Morrow, Mark	Wentworth East	NDP	Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
			Vice-Chair, standing committee on administration of justice
Murdoch, Bill	Grey	PC	
Murdock, Sharon	Sudbury	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Labour
Nixon, Robert F.	Brant-Haldimand	Lib	Leader of the Official Opposition
North, Hon Peter	Elgin	NDP	Minister of Tourism and Recreation

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
O'Connor, Lawrence	Durham-York	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of the Environment Vice-Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Offer, Steven	Mississauga North	Lib	
O'Neil, Hugh P.	Quinte	Lib	
O'Neill, Yvonne	Ottawa-Rideau	Lib	
Owens, Stephen	Scarborough Centre	NDP	
Perruzza, Anthony	Downsview	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Revenue
Philip, Hon Ed	Etobicoke-Rexdale	NDP	Minister of Transportation
Phillips, Gerry	Scarborough-Agincourt	Lib	
Pilkey, Hon Allan	Oshawa	NDP	Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology
Poirier, Jean	Prescott and Russell	Lib	
Poole, Dianne	Eglinton	Lib	Vice-Chair, standing committee on public accounts
Pouliot, Hon Gilles	Lake Nipigon	NDP	Minister of Mines, minister responsible for francophone affairs Premier, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Rae, Hon Bob	York South	NDP	
Ramsay, David	Timiskaming	Lib	
Rizzo, Tony	Oakwood	Ind	
Runciman, Robert W.	Leeds-Grenville	PC	Chair, standing committee on government agencies
Ruprecht, Tony	Parkdale	Lib	
Scott, Ian G.	St George-St David	Lib	
Silipo, Tony	Dovercourt	NDP	Chair, select committee on Ontario in Confederation
Sola, John	Mississauga East	Lib	
Sorbara, Gregory S.	York Centre	Lib	
Sterling, Norman W.	Carleton	PC	
Stockwell, Chris	Etobicoke West	PC	
Sullivan, Barbara	Halton Centre	Lib	
Sutherland, Kimble	Oxford	NDP	Chair, standing committee on regulations and private bills
Swarbrick, Hon Anne	Scarborough West	NDP	Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues
Tilson, David	Dufferin-Peel	PC	
Turnbull, David	York Mills	PC	
Villeneuve, Noble	S-D-G & East Grenville	PC	Second Deputy Chair of the Committee of the Whole House
Ward, Brad	Brantford	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Skills Development
Ward, Margery	Don Mills	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Government Services
Wark-Martyn, Hon Shelley	Port Arthur	NDP	Minister of Revenue
Warner, Hon David	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP	Speaker Co-Chair, special committee on the parliamentary precinct
Waters, Daniel	Muskoka-Georgian Bay	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation Vice-Chair, standing committee on resources development
Wessenger, Paul	Simcoe Centre	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Attorney General
White, Drummond	Durham Centre	NDP	Chair, standing committee on administration of justice Vice-Chair, standing committee on the Ombudsman
Wildman, Hon Bud	Algoma	NDP	Minister of Natural Resources, minister responsible for native affairs
Wilson, Hon Fred	Frontenac-Addington	NDP	Minister of Government Services
Wilson, Gary	Kingston and The Islands	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Culture and Communications
Wilson, Jim	Simcoe West	PC	
Winninger, David	London South	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the minister responsible for native affairs
Wiseman, Jim	Durham West	NDP	Chair, standing committee on finance and economic affairs
Witmer, Elizabeth	Waterloo North	PC	

Name of member	Constituency	Party	Other responsibilities
Wood, Len	Cochrane North	NDP	Parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources
Ziemba, Hon Elaine	High Park-Swansea	NDP	Minister of Citizenship, minister responsible for disabled persons, minister responsible for the Ontario Human Rights Commission, minister responsible for race relations, minister responsible for senior citizens' affairs

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

STANDING COMMITTEES

Administration of justice

Chair: Drummond White

Vice-Chair: Mark Morrow

Members: Gary Carr, Robert Chiarelli, Derek Fletcher, Charles Harnick, Irene Mathysen, Gordon Mills, Jean Poirier, Gregory S. Sorbara, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Lisa Freedman

Estimates

Chair: Cameron Jackson

Vice-Chair: Margaret Marland

Members: Gary Carr, Hans Daigeler, Will Ferguson, Karen Haslam, Paul R. Johnson, Wayne Lessard, Dalton McGuinty, Lyn McLeod, Anthony Perruzza, Gary Wilson
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Finance and economic affairs

Chair: Jim Wiseman

Vice-Chair: Ron Hansen

Members: David Christopherson, Norman Jamison, Monte Kwinter, Gerry Phillips, Norman W. Sterling, Chris Stockwell, Barbara Sullivan, Kimble Sutherland, Brad Ward, Margery Ward
Clerk: Todd Decker

General government

Chair: Remo Mancini

Vice-Chair: Michael A. Brown

Members: Donald Abel, Gilles Bisson, Dennis Drainville, Noel Duignan, Margaret H. Harrington, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Yvonne O'Neill, Ian G. Scott, David Turnbull
Clerk: Deborah Deller

Government agencies

Chair: Robert W. Runciman

Vice-Chair: Allan K. McLean

Members: James J. Bradley, Robert Frankford, Bernard Grandmaître, Karen Haslam, Pat Hayes, Dalton McGuinty, Tony Silipo, Chris Stockwell, Daniel Waters, Jim Wiseman
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Legislative Assembly

Chair: Noel Duignan

Vice-Chair: Ellen MacKinnon

Members: Mike Cooper, Robert Frankford, Norman Jamison, Margaret Marland, Irene Mathysen, Carman McClelland, Gilles E. Morin, Hugh P. O'Neil, Stephen Owens, Noble Villeneuve
Clerk: Douglas Arnott

Ombudsman

Chair: Mark Morrow

Vice-Chair: Drummond White

Members: Alvin Curling, Joan M. Fawcett, D. James Henderson, Peter Kormos, George Mammoliti, Bill Murdoch, Margery Ward, Paul Wessinger, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Franco Carrozza

Public accounts

Chair: Robert V. Callahan

Vice-Chair: Dianne Poole

Members: James J. Bradley, Sean G. Conway, Mike Cooper, W. Donald Cousens, Christel Haeck, Pat Hayes, Paul R. Johnson, Ellen MacKinnon, Lawrence O'Connor, David Tilson
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Regulations and private bills

Chair: Kimble Sutherland

Vice-Chair: Lawrence O'Connor

Members: Donald Abel, Will Ferguson, Derek Fletcher, Ron Hansen, Leo Jordan, Ellen MacKinnon, Frank Miclash, Tony Ruprecht, John Sola, Jim Wilson
Clerk: Todd Decker

Resources development

Chair: Peter Kormos

Vice-Chair: Daniel Waters

Members: Ted Arnott, John C. Cleary, George Dadamo, Leo Jordan, Paul Klopp, Sharon Murdock, Steven Offer, David Ramsay, Len Wood
Clerk: Harold Brown

Social development

Chair: Elinor Caplan

Vice-Chair: Joseph Cordiano

Members: Charles Beer, Christel Haeck, Randy R. Hope, Gary Malkowski, Tony Martin, Lyn McLeod, Stephen Owens, Tony Silipo, Jim Wilson, Elizabeth Witmer
Clerk: Lynn Mellor

SELECT COMMITTEE

Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo

Vice-Chair: Gilles Bisson

Members: Charles Beer, Ernie Eves, Charles Harnick, Margaret Harrington, Gary Malkowski, Irene Mathysen, Steven Offer, Yvonne O'Neill, Fred Wilson, David Winninger
Clerk: Harold Brown

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Precinct

Co-Chair: David Warner

Co-Chair: Noel Duignan

Members: Dianne Cunningham, Remo Mancini, Kimble Sutherland
Clerk: Smirle Forsyth

CONTENTS

Tuesday 7 May 1991

Members' statements

Parliamentary process	1207
Mr Daigeler	
Education Week	1207
Mrs Cunningham	
Haliburton School of Fine Arts	1207
Mr Drainville	
Automobile insurance	1207
Mr Chiarelli	
Nurses Appreciation Week	1208
Mr Eves	
Sault Ste Marie Greyhounds	1208
Mr Martin	
Oak Ridges moraine	1208
Mr Beer	
Lev Lukianenko	1208
Mr Jackson	
Queen's Venturer Awards	1209
Mr Malkowski	

Statements by the ministry

Land registration	1212
Ms Churley	
Forest management	1212
Mr Wildman	
Tourism and recreation for the disabled	1213
Mr North	

Responses

Land registration	1214
Mr McClelland	
Forest management	1214
Mr Ramsay	
Tourism and recreation for the disabled	1215
Mr Kwinter	
Forest management	1215
Mr McLean	
Tourism and recreation for the disabled	1215
Mr J. Wilson	
Land registration	1215
Mr Runciman	

Oral questions

Parliamentary process	1216
Mr Nixon	
Mr Rae	
Ministerial responsibility	1217
Mr Nixon	
Mr Hampton	

Budget	1218
Mr Harris	
Mr Rae	
Case of Brian Rapson	1219
Mr Harnick	
Mr Hampton	
Education program evaluation	1220
Mr Beer	
Mrs Boyd	
Mrs Cunningham	
Occupational health and safety	1221
Mr Morrow	
Mr Mackenzie	
Forest management	1222
Mr Ramsay	
Mr Wildman	
TVOntario	1222
Mrs Marland	
Mr Marchese	
Police dress code	1223
Mr Duignan	
Mr Farnan	
Forest management	1224
Mrs Sullivan	
Mr Wildman	

Motion

Order of business	1224
Miss Martel	
Mr Eves	
Mr Sterling	
Mr Jackson	
Agreed to	1225

Second reading

Mortgages Amendment Act, 1990, Bill 40	1225
Mr Hampton	1225
Mr Harris	1226
Mr. Ferguson	1226
Mr Harnick	1226
Adjourned	1226

Other business

Estimates	1207
Ms Lankin	
Visitors	1209
The Speaker	

Written questions	1209
Mrs Cunningham	
Mr Carr	
Mr Runciman	
Mrs Marland	
Mrs Witmer	
Mr Eves	
Mr Harris	
Ministerial statements	1213
Mr Curling	

Correction	1224
Mr Harris	
Adjournment	1226

Lists of members

Members and their responsibilities	1227
Committees of the Legislative Assembly	1230

045620026

FEB 26 1992

